DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 734 95 SP 010 447

AUTHOR Nicholson, Alexander M.; And Others
TITLE The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education. An Analytic Review. ISTE Report III.
INSTITUTION National Center for Education Statistics (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 112p.; For related documents, see SP 010 446-449

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; *Content Analysis; Inservice Courses; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Literature Reviews; *Teacher Education; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Study

ABSTRACT

As part of the Inservice Teacher Education (ISTE) Concepts Study, more than 2,000 books, periodicals, and unpublished papers written after 1957 were consulted and reviewed. The purpose of the review was the identification of the data needs and major issues in inservice education. The literature was identified, read, and categorized; and substantive areas were identified and selected for this report. These include: the varieties of inservice education; collaborative arrangements; value orientations toward inservice education; definitions of inservice education; and other issues, a selection of emergent questions and issues. Each of these is discussed. (JMF)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED129734

# REPORT III

# Literature

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

**Nicholson • Joyce**
with **Parker** & **Waterman**

2

ISTE

REPORT III

# The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education

## An Analytic Review

**Alexander M. Nicholson**
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

**Bruce R. Joyce**
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

with **Donald W. Parker**
Howard University

**Floyd T. Waterman**
University of Nebraska, Omaha

June 1976

Palo Alto, California

The Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project was sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Teacher Corps.

Funds were administered and interviews conducted by the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers at:

| | |
|---|---|
| University of Southern California | William C. Hill, Director |
| University of Nebraska, Omaha | Floyd T. Waterman, Director |
| Wayne State University | Barbara A. Vance, Director |
| Howard University | Donald W. Parker, Director |
| University of Georgia | Michael G. Baker, Director |

The project was coordinated by:

| | |
|---|---|
| Bruce R. Joyce | Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching |
| Lucy F. Peck | Hofstra University |

The views presented are the responsibility of the project staff and are not necessarily the opinions of the funding agencies.

Project Monitors:

| | |
|---|---|
| Shirley A. Steele | National Center for Education Statistics |
| Velma J. Robinson | Teacher Corps |

Chief Administrators of the agencies:

| | |
|---|---|
| Marie D. Eldridge | National Center for Education Statistics |
| William L. Smith | Teacher Corps |

CONTENTS


Project Personnel: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching vii

Project Personnel: Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers viii

States in which Interviews Were Conducted ix

History and Structure of the ISTE Project x

INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW 1

THE VARIETIES OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION 4

- The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education 4
- The Contexts for Inservice Teacher Education 6
  - Job-Embedded 6
  - Job-Related 9
  - Credential-Oriented 11
  - Professional Organization-Related 12
  - Self-Directed 14
- The Search for Effective Inservice Teacher Education 16
  - The State of the Field 16
  - Substantive Findings 20
- Approaches to the Structure of Inservice Teacher Education 22
- Reference Notes 24

COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS 33

- Why Collaboration? 33
- What Entities Should Be Included 37
- The Roles of the Entities 39
- Role Limitations of the Entities 40

The Emerging Definitions of Parity 46
Teacher Centers and Consortia 49
Reference Notes 53

VALUE ORIENTATIONS TOWARD INSERVICE EDUCATION 57
Teaching as Mutual Self-Discovery 57
Teaching as Curriculum Implementation 62
The Analytic Approach to Teaching 68
Reference Notes 74

DEFINITIONS OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION 79
An Intuitive Definition 79
Synonyms 79
Definitions 80
Issues Raised by the Definitions 84
Definitions and Issues 87
Reference Notes 89

OTHER ISSUES IN INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION 91
A Review of the Review 91
Evaluation 91
Incentives 92
Ancillary Problems 93
Reference Notes 95

Appendix A: Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers 97

Appendix B: Project Consultant Interviewers 98

PROJECT PERSONNEL

STANFORD CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN TEACHING

| | |
|---|---|
| Bruce R. Joyce | Project Coordinator |
| Lucy F. Peck<br>Hofstra University | Project Coordinator |
| Terry J. Rice | Coordinator of Editing |
| Marilyn R. Harper | Coordinator of Finances and Final Reports |
| Kathleen M. McNair | Data Analyst |
| Richard Diaz<br>University of Southern California | Data Analyst |
| Pamela H. David | Data Analyst |
| Kenneth R. Howey<br>University of Minnesota | Consultant |
| Sam J. Yarger<br>Syracuse University | Consultant |
| Louis J. Rubin<br>University of Illinois | Consultant |
| Elinore R. Brown | Typist |
| Colette R. Childs | Typist |

PROJECT PERSONNEL

TEACHER CORPS RECRUITMENT AND TECHNICAL RESOURCE CENTERS

WESTERN CENTER

| | |
|---|---|
| William C. Hill | Director |
| Joseph Romo | Associate Director |
| Ramona Gordon | Office Manager |
| Judy English | Typist |
| Roxie Bagley | Recruiter |

MIDWESTERN CENTER

| | |
|---|---|
| Floyd T. Waterman | Director |
| Thomas Dean | Associate Director |
| Edna Alexander | Administrative Assistant |

GREAT LAKES CENTER

| | |
|---|---|
| Barbara A. Vance | Director |
| Wilbert Bledsoe | Associate Director |
| Elentine Bonner | Office Manager |
| Caroline Wallace | Secretary/Bookkeeper |
| Ruth Peach | Secretary |
| Karen Crawford | Secretary |

NORTHEASTERN CENTER

| | |
|---|---|
| Donald W. Parker | Director |
| Patricia Matthews | Associate Director |
| Shirley Jones | Chief Application Processor |
| Athea Rayo | Secretary |
| Carol Coy | Assistant |
| Marian Hankerson | Assistant |

SOUTHEASTERN CENTER

| | |
|---|---|
| Michael G. Baker | Director |
| Barbara Ogletree | Survey Coordinator |
| Roger Bryant | Technical Assistant |
| Linda Anderson | Secretary/Bookkeeper |
| Mary Davis | Secretary |

STATES IN WHICH INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED

Alabama
Arizona
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin

District of Columbia

# HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF THE ISTE PROJECT

In June of 1975, the National Center for Education Statistics, with the cooperation of the National Teacher Corps, made the decision to inaugurate a series of studies in inservice teacher education. The phase of the study which is reported in these monographs is that of conceptualization.

Three sources of data were consulted in order to build concepts about the structure of inservice teacher education. The first of these was the existing literature. The second source of data were the positions of experts about the nature of the primary issues involved in the reconceptualization of the area. The third source were the opinions of several categories of interested parties, including teachers, administrators of school districts, school board members, community members, congressional representatives, state department of education officials, and higher education administration and faculty, about the major issues involved in inservice teacher education and the alternative ways of approaching these issues.

There were two primary purposes of the study. The first was to determine the data needs in the area. This information is to be used as the base for a succession of studies to determine the facts about inservice teacher education, the alternative issues, and the alternative solutions to these issues. The second purpose of the study was to conceptualize the area in such a way that Teacher Corps could guide its activities more effectively in light of the facts and opinions of the field.

The inservice teacher education project was coordinated by Bruce Joyce of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching and Lucy Peck of Hofstra University. The staffs of the five Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers arranged for the interviews, managed budgetary matters, developed small conferences in important areas of inservice education, and contributed to the editing and publishing of the present reports.

This monograph is one of a series of five reports on the conceptualizing phase of the study of in ce teacher education. Following is an outline of the monographs:

Report I: Issues to Face

Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth R. Howey, Sam J. Yarger, and the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Center Directors

Report II: Interviews: Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers

Bruce R. Joyce, Kathleen M. McNair, Richard Diaz, and Michael D. McKibbin
with Floyd T. Waterman and Michael G. Baker for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report III: The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education: An Analytic Review

Alexander M. Nicholson and Bruce R. Joyce
with Donald W. Parker and Floyd T. Waterman for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report IV: Creative Authority and Collaboration

A collection of position papers by Sam J. Yarger, James Boyer, Kenneth R. Howey, Marsha Weil, Ralph M. Pais, Winifred I. Warnat, Robert D. Bhaerman, Robert Luke, and David Darland
with introductions by Sam J. Yarger and Bruce R. Joyce
with William C. Hill for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

Report V: Cultural Pluralism and Social Change

A collection of position papers by Richard M. Brandt, Richard P. Mesa, Marilyn Nelson, David D. Marsh, Louis J. Rubin, Margaret C. Ashworth, Elsa N. Brizzi, and Henrietta V. Whiteman
with introductions by Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth R. Howey, and James Boyer
with Barbara A. Vance for the Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers

The first report is a relatively short summary of the data needs in inservice education and the major issues identified from the literature, the interviews, and the position papers. The second report contains the results of the interviews with more than one thousand teachers, school administrators, higher education administrators and faculty, and others concerned with policy making in the inservice area. An analysis of the literature in the field is described in the third report, while in the fourth and fifth reports shortened versions of position papers in several major areas are presented. In the fourth report the problems of collaboration are explored, and issues attendant to cultural pluralism and social change are examined in the fifth report.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW

It is very clear by this time that inservice teacher education is about to be subjected to substantial forces directed at changing it. Some of these forces are from particular segments of the education professions. For various reasons, teachers, higher education faculty and administrators, school districts, teacher organizations, state departments of education, and officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are pressing for reform (not by any means for the same reforms). Interested members of the general public are raising serious questions about the role of teacher education in improving the quality of education. The "visible" minorities in America are asking for new forms of multicultural education and bilingual schools, both of which will depend heavily on the re-education of many teachers. Federal and state legislatures are looking for ways of inducing more effective utilization of present resources and stimulating reform.

This report presents an analysis of much of the literature which deals with the general substance, process, and organization of teacher education. Literature directed primarily at other areas of education was not analyzed for applications to teacher education (elementary and secondary curriculum, school organization, curriculum and instruction in academic subjects, "special" education, all have implications for inservice education) nor was the staff development literature from other professions analyzed in detail.

The review was also concentrated on the years after 1957, when a definitive yearbook appeared under the sponsorship of the National Society for the Study of Education, although some earlier literature is discussed.

More than two thousand books, periodicals, and unpublished papers were consulted in the review. Over one thousand items were obtained through ERIC and about six hundred were located in journals.

The central purpose of the review was to identify data needs and major issues in inservice education. To accomplish this, straightforward procedures were followed:

(1) The literature was identified and read.

(2) The literature was grouped into categories of topics discussed.

(3) Issues were identified and discussed with consultants.

(4) Substantive areas were selected to be the structure of this report.

(5) Finally, the analytic essays which are presented here were written discussed with consultants, revised, and edited.

The essays are about:

Varieties of Inservice Education. Whereas many discussions of inservice education explicitly or implicitly assume that it is a matter of college courses or similar arrangements, the broad literature reveals a substantial variety of experiences which are probably appropriate for different purposes and teachers. The variety is rich and encouraging. Information about the actual use of this variety and opinions about the effectiveness of the experiences are lacking at present and should be obtained.

Collaborative Arrangements. The varieties of collaboration in teacher education are increasing. The centrality of control in teacher education was until recently vested in the credentialing process and the acquisition of college courses (or their equivalent) as the currency of professional qualification. The situation is changing, to put it mildly, and the issues swarm about in the literature, not always cogently discussed or distinguished from each other, but very much there.

Value Orientations Toward Inservice Education. Educational philosophies have vied for attention in elementary and secondary education for many years, as both fuel and apology for many kinds of educational reform. Thus has it been in staff development. In this essay the alternative philosophical models are examined and related to movements in general education.

Definitions of Inservice Education. This essay was prompted by the array of terms encountered and the variety of meanings (many the result of loose usage) ascribed to them. Interestingly, many of the issues in the area emerge as definitions are examined.

Other Issues. The previous categories (varieties, collaboration, value orientations and definitions) do not subsume all possible or probable issues. The concluding essay deals with a selection of emergent questions and issues.

Throughout the review is a search for conceptual handles on inservice education. The nature of the literature compels this. Important questions are clouded by rhetoric, vague and redundant language, and, above all, by the lack of a general analytic process which separates fact from ideology, issue and concept.

# THE VARIETIES OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

## THE LITERATURE ON INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

The literature on inservice teacher education is as voluminous--and as haphazard--as the programs it describes. There are more than one thousand documents on the subject entered in the ERIC system[1] as well as many hundreds of articles reported in the Current Index to Journals in Education[2] and the Education Index.[3] Added to these are the yearbooks of various education organizations,[4] books and other collections of writings on the subject, and uncatalogued papers and reports too numerous to mention.

Yet despite the magnitude of the literature, there is only a handful of works that deal with inservice in any sort of comprehensive manner. The majority of reports and articles are on the lowest level of generality: they are expository descriptions, usually uncritical, of specific existing or completed inservice projects.[5] Less frequent are works of a slightly higher order of generality. These include surveys covering several projects; pieces of educational research; directories and guidebooks on reading, workshops, institutes, or consultants; catalogs of teacher training products; and proposed models or suggestions for future inservice. On the most rarified level are found the few works that attempt to deal with the subject of inservice teacher education as a whole: reviews of literature or research and a few other comprehensive studies.

What seems to be entirely lacking, however, from the literature is a usable typology of approaches to inservice education (much more so one that is commonly agreed upon or that provides a comparative analysis of the different possibilities). In 1957, Berge, Harris, and Walden[6] surveyed several hundred school districts across the country and arrived at three categories of approaches to inservice education: (1) the centralized approach, in which inservice is initiated and conducted by persons in the central office of the school system; (2) the decentralized approach, in

which inservice is the responsibility of the local school staff themselves; and (3) the centrally coordinated approach, in which local programs are coordinated and assisted through the central office. This is an interesting but rather simplistic analysis, and it touches only upon the political structure of inservice activities--who initiates and controls what.

In 1966, the NEA compiled a list[7] of nineteen different types of inservice teacher education: classes and courses, institutes, conferences, workshops, staff meetings, committee work, professional reading, individual conferences, visits and demonstrations by outside parties, field trips, travel, camping, work experience, teacher exchanges, research, professional writing, professional association work, cultural experiences, and community organization work. The list is undeniably comprehensive--but to the point of uselessness. Virtually everything a teacher does, inside school or outside, constitutes inservice education!

Edelfelt[8] reviewed several hundred sources in the ERIC system from 1973 and 1974 and came up with a list of twenty types of inservice education. It is interesting to note the new arrivals, many of them based on technological developments and their application to education: teacher centers, minicourses, microteaching, simulations, role playing, videotape analysis of teacher behavior, and television lessons. His list, however, is still just a list; there is no order to it, no sense of the relationships among the different "types" of inservice education. He doesn't mention, for example, that videotape analysis of teacher behavior is one important element in microteaching; or that microteaching is frequently the technique on which minicourses are built (in particular, the Minicourses produced by the Far West Laboratory); or that minicourses are among the self-administering instructional materials used in teacher centers.

Bush,[9] in 1971, categorized the four forms that inservice teacher education was currently taking as follows: (1) expository exhortations, (2) demonstration teaching, (3) supervised trials, and (4) analysis of performance. This scheme provides a useful conceptual framework for sorting out the various methods of inservice, but it is too abstract to offer much information about the differences among them.

It appears to us at this point that the literature is extensive enough to provide a rudimentary typology of inservice education, especially with respect to the methods of training that are being used and the contexts within which they are taking place. Such a typology will help us better understand what is being done as well as what has not been done. It should also be useful for planners of inservice programs so that they can, in a relatively shorthand manner, identify the state of the field and the options which have been most commonly used.

In this paper we will suggest five general contexts for inservice education: the job-embedded, the job-related, the credential-oriented, the professional-organization-related, and the self-directed. To each context there may be imagined a corresponding role which the teacher plays. The teacher may be seen as, respectively, an employee of a school, a colleague of other teachers, a student of higher education, a member of a profession, or an individual craftsman.

These categories that we are proposing do not necessarily represent any kind of philosophical or psychological orientation, nor are they intended to be mutually exclusive. It is not being suggested that one can by examining them arrive a priori at a decision as to which is best. Each context does have, however, certain advantages, and each requires different arrangements in order to carry it out.

## THE CONTEXTS FOR INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

JOB-EMBEDDED: Any job provides per se the opportunity for activities which can result in professional growth. Simply performing the tasks of teaching and interacting informally with other teachers enables one to learn more about teaching. The learning that does occur in such a way, however, is random and unplanned and usually difficult to measure and take account of.

The traditional isolation of teachers from one another has resulted in fewer interactive opportunities than exist in other professions, but this situation need not be the case. The solo practitioner in medicine or law, for example, can learn much from his own experience but lacks the feedback, the sharing knowledge, and the collaborative experiences that the member of a large clinic or firm enjoys with his colleagues. Almost all

teachers work in situations where there are others of their number also working. The possibilities, therefore, of structuring and planning job-embedded inservice programs seem the most logical place to begin.

In the literature we find four typical modes of job-embedded inservice education. These are committee work for program planning and organization, the interaction in team teaching, interaction with consultants provided by the district, and professional reading and curriculum analysis.

Committee work is one of the more traditional, widely accepted forms of inservice education; it is frequently mentioned but rarely discussed in the literature. The majority of committee work is related to curriculum planning, although a certain amount has to do with the development of special activities, such as school-wide plays and fairs, and with relationships with parents' organizations. In the course of working with other teachers on a curriculum committee, a teacher is exposed to alternative ways of handling the curriculum, various instructional materials which he could adopt, and teaching strategies employed by other teachers. Department meetings in some secondary schools are devoted largely to the planning of courses and to finding ways of working together to carry out the plans.

Teaching in teams provides an opportunity to learn by observing other teachers and by interacting with the team leader. A well-organized team provides many of the functions of committees and in addition provides the opportunity for relatively close-order clinical analysis of teaching. The Harvard-Lexington Project of the late 1950's and early 1960's included much instruction in clinical analysis.(10)

Committee work and team teaching have in common that they are, for purposes of inservice education, primarily the byproduct of a regular school activity. This attribute is perhaps the essence of the job-embedded context. The teacher is not required to go elsewhere than where he works at a time other than when he works, nor is he asked to do something other than his regular tasks. The true value of such inservice lies in its unity (with the teacher's job) and its economy (accomplishing several purposes at once). Surveys of teacher attitudes and comparative studies of inservice alternatives indicate a strong preference on the part of teachers for types of inservice that can be completed at school during school hours.(11) By using innovative techniques such as team teaching and collegial work, as, for example, those promoted by John Goodlad in the League of Cooperating

Schools,[12] inservice education can be incorporated directly into the act of teaching.

There are other effective job-embedded approaches that are somewhat less directly related to the act of teaching. Foremost among these is the use of consultants. One type of consultant is the independent contractor. Usually associated with a university or other research facility or with a private educational consulting firm, this consultant generally has some particular products or services to offer and is called upon when his expertise is deemed useful to the needs of a school or a teacher. The other type is the consultant who is employed full-time by the school district. The difference between these types and their respective usefulness may be better understood by analogizing the district to a large corporation with an ongoing need for legal advice. The corporation will sometimes call upon an outside law firm for specialized advice in certain situations but probably also has a staff of in-house counsel for taking care of its recurring legal problems. The "in-house" consultants of a school district may include principals, curriculum supervisors, and reading and other specialists, as well as regular classroom teachers assigned to consulting duty on a rotating basis.

The value of a consultant is easily understood.[13] An expert reading consultant can demonstrate a reading method with the very children with whom the teacher is going to work, using the same materials--thereby providing an almost exact model to be followed. Then the consultant and teacher can discuss the problems which the teacher has in using that particular method. This modeling technique requires, however, a supportive social context in order to be successful.

Just as there are many different persons who can serve as consultants, the literature reveals many different ways of structuring the practice of consultation: it can be mandatory or voluntary; pre-established or variable in content; at regular intervals or as needed; and so forth. The prevailing trend of the literature, however, indicates that consultation should be decentralized and individualized; in other words, it should be determined by the teacher himself. Lillian Katz has reported on several studies[14] of inservice consultation using the "advisory approach," which is defined by three characteristics: (1) it is only at the teacher's request;

(2) it is in terms of the teacher's expressed needs; and (3) it is in situ, that is, at school during school hours. This approach seems to capture the necessary elements of teacher-centered consultation.

Professional reading in the job context is probably done by teachers much less than one might expect. The enormous used book business in education books at universities attests to the fact that teachers frequently turn back the general curriculum and instruction methods books which have been used in their courses rather than keep them as references. Schools of education do not ordinarily, at either the preservice or in-service level, recommend a standard set of references. Researchers use such books as the Bloom Taxonomy[15] and Handbook of Research on Teaching[16] routinely and know their language, but teachers rarely turn to these works in preparing lessons or examinations. Stronger school libraries for teachers would be a useful first step toward greater utilization of inservice reading on the job.

JOB-RELATED: Job-embedded approaches to inservice education are perhaps the most basic and the most obvious; they are, however, only the starting point in the range of possibilities. We have now to consider other job-related training that is not strictly a part of the teacher's job. This context for inservice education includes both some traditional and some innovative methods.

The most important traditional type of inservice in this category is the workshop. Aside from college courses, the workshop has been the most widely used form of inservice education.[17] A workshop consists of a group of teachers working together, with a leader and perhaps some resource persons, on problems they have that they are interested in solving. Held after school hours or on the weekend, the workshop may be conducted at the school or some other designated place. The problems with workshops include the fact that they are extra duty for teachers (after regular hours and sometimes away from school) and that they are often dictated from above; in a word, they are often not responsive to the teachers' needs.

Other traditional job-related types of inservice education are teacher exchanges and visits. From these activities teachers have the opportunity to observe other teachers in action and to see how other schools operate.

The primary innovation in the job-related context is the teacher center, in all of its many embodiments,[18] and the training packages that have been developed for use by teachers.[19] The basic idea here is that teachers should be able, on their own initiative and at their convenience, to go to a place at or near their school where they can interact with their colleagues and receive supplementary training. The teacher center concept derives from an English precedent, the official basis of which was the James Report's recommendation that teacher centers be established across the nation in order to allow teachers the opportunity to explore various training materials.[20] The English version is a relatively informal center where teachers can meet and socialize and pursue their educational interests. It is usually funded and managed by the local education authority.

The teacher center movement in the United States is a much more diverse undertaking. Yarger [21] has identified almost six hundred different programs which fit his definition of "teacher center." Some centers are established by schools or school districts; others by universities and colleges; still others by consortia of entities working together. The differences among them are immense; what they have in common is that their sole raison d'être is to provide teachers the chance to improve themselves at their own discretion.

The primary resource of the teacher centers is the self-administering teacher training package, several hundred of which have already been produced by the national educational laboratories, research and development centers, and others. For example, the Far West Laboratory for Educational Development has produced several Minicourses[22] on various skills, which have been field-tested and validated and are available nationwide. Many such training packages can be administered either individually or to a small group. They offer the advantages of the latest developments in educational technology and can be used at the teacher's leisure.

Another potentially promising development in this area, although still in embryonic stages, is mobile computer-assisted instruction. A pioneering program out of Pennsylvania State University[23] offered computerized inservice courses to teachers in rural areas of the state. The program reported lower costs and increased achievement in less time than for a comparable university-based course or institute. The instruction was offered, furthermore, at the teacher's own rate of progress and at a time

convenient to him. Conceptually, however, this arrangement is essentially just a variation on the teacher center idea: the traveling van with its computer terminals can be thought of as a mobile teacher center, available at different times to different schools too small and remote to support centers of their own.

CREDENTIAL-ORIENTED: Until very recently, by far the most pervasive approach to inservice education has been the orientation toward various kinds of professional credentials.[24] In this context the teacher is cast as a student of higher education, taking courses and perhaps pursuing a degree, much as he did in college in the preservice component of his education. The ascendance of this approach, however, is belied by the literature: there is relatively little to be found concerning the relation of college courses to inservice teacher education. Most of the literature here describes particular courses or institutes, with a few pieces reaching a higher level of generality. Let us suggest that the reason for this lack may be that college-based programs are too often undertaken as an end in themselves and not in relation to the specific goals of improving the teacher's classroom performance.

The orientation toward college credits is the framework of the structure of the teaching profession. Receipt of professional certification and renewal of certification are often dependent on the completion of a course of study offered by higher education institutions or other courses accredited by school districts or states. Salary increments have been tied to higher degrees. In many cases, state universities offer courses at a lower rate for teachers than for other categories of students. By making them cheaper and in some cases waiving tuition fees entirely, the states and their school districts have attempted to promote professional development along this route. The number of teachers holding advanced degrees is astonishing.[25]

Movement into all kinds of specialties, administration and supervision, and roles as consultants and helping-teachers has been tied to credentials. The result is that anyone who has ambitions beyond the classroom must take higher education courses and organize them along the lines of the degree or credential needed.

It is undeniable that the resources and expertise of the higher education institution are necessary not only for the initial preparation of teachers but also for their continuing education. The scholarship and detachment of the university serve to counterbalance the attention to immediate problems with which the practicing teacher must concern himself.[26] What are needed are new partnerships, new arrangements whereby the school and university share responsibility for inservice education. One innovative program of this sort involved the collaboration of a professor with an elementary teacher.[27] After initial discussion, the professor would propose a theory; the teacher would test it out in his classroom; and both would evaluate the results. The value of such a program is that the teacher takes on the role of scholar and researcher while actually performing his job; this instead of sitting in a classroom listening to a lecture on new theories and research on how to teach.

As the roles of teacher and student are correlative (one cannot exist without the other), the possibilities for college-based inservice education cannot be overlooked. The strong tradition of college inservice will probably be continued and redirected toward more concrete needs of teachers.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION-RELATED: Teachers as a collectivity can be thought of as a unique hybrid that partakes of the natures of both the labor union and the organized profession. Like labor unions, teachers' associations concern themselves with such issues as salaries, fringe benefits, grievance procedures, and job security.[28] Increasingly, however, teachers want to be thought of as professionals; references are constantly being made to "the profession." That teaching has not achieved the full status of a profession can be inferred from the many current proposals being voiced that aim toward the increased professionalization of teaching.[29] Without trying to define what a profession is, suffice it to say that, at the very least, one characteristic is that a profession takes upon itself the responsibility for controlling and maintaining the quality of its membership. In law, for example, bar associations maintain professional development by means of a program called Continuing Education of the Bar. Included in this program are courses, both for renewal and for updating, and a variety of publications of which some cover the latest cases, statutes, and regulations and others organize sundry legal materials into working disciplines. If

teachers are seriously committed to attaining professional stature, then their collective responsibility for inservice education must be recognized and fulfilled.

Professional organizations of teachers have been established around most of the curriculum areas and in several other areas of common interest. Conventions and workshops are among the more traditional inservice methods sponsored by such organizations; a wide array of these activities is available to those teachers who are able to take advantage of them. Some school districts provide travel and living expenses for teachers to attend professional meetings but this practice is by no means common. Publishers have often subsidized such efforts and used them partly as a means of presenting their materials, while at the same time presenting other materials only somewhat less prominently. Specialized professional journals serve to keep teachers informed on current developments in their areas of interest.

Professional organizations are also starting, moreover, to become involved in inservice education in a more comprehensive manner, rather than just providing various ad hoc services. One thrust of this tendency is aimed at the first step of any inservice program--finding out what needs to be done. Several national and state organizations have made polls of current inservice practices, their shortcomings, and teachers' assessed needs for training.(30) The AFT and the NEA have proposed models for teacher-run teacher centers, an alternative to other versions that are currently being tried.(31) This idea is more in line with the original English concept than most other American adaptations of the teacher center idea. Some associations are even getting into the training product business in the belief that a specialized association can lend its collective practical expertise to the research and development enterprise. One example of this trend is the International Reading Association's Competency-Based Teacher Education Model, which has seventeen components,referred to as resource modules.(32)

The NEA has also sponsored a rather revolutionary project in teacher inservice, a project in which the teachers themselves have been solely responsible for the program from its conception and design all the way through its evaluation.(33) Referred to as the Reform in Teacher Education project, it arose as a counterproposal to the recommendations of Task

Force '72 of the U.S. Office of Education. The unique idea behind the project was that responsibility for the reform of teacher education should be placed squarely on teachers and teacher associations (including national and state associations but primarily local ones) and that such responsibility should be fixed through negotiated agreements. Several preliminary programs were carried out with varying degrees of success, and the overall concept has been recommended for further and wider implementation.(34)

The AFT has also been active in the field of inservice education. Robert Bhaerman, Director of Research for the AFT, has raised the argument that inservice policies cannot be determined in a vacuum, as it were, but must be considered in relation to such other issues as certification levels, obsolescence of skills, and renewal of certificates.(35) To remedy the problem of obsolescence which he concedes exists, Bhaerman suggests a plan called the "Continuous Progress Approach"(36) as an alternative to rigid levels and forced renewals of certification. Like the NEA project, Bhaerman's scheme would be achieved through negotiated contracts, but, in contrast, it would be based on the individual teacher's self-diagnosis, self-development, and self-evaluation, rather than on a collective, teacher-association approach. Encompassed within this plan would be conventional (professional reading, workshops, etc.) as well as innovative (teacher centers, staff development laboratories) techniques of inservice education. The plan's policy would also cover such diverse areas as teaching assignments and recruitment and selection of teachers. Although the plan can be criticized for being too abstract, too doctrinaire, and too untested, it does have the significant merit of comprehensiveness of approach to several currently engaging problems in teacher education.

SELF-DIRECTED: The final approach to inservice education found in the literature is the self-directed one. The assumption underlying this sort of activity is that there are certain needs for professional development that the individual teacher himself can best understand and fulfill. The teacher is seen as a self-motivated craftsman or professional who is interested in maintaining the currency of his skills and knowledge, either because what he is learning will be directly applicable in his classroom or simply because he wants to keep abreast of developments in his field for his own

personal satisfaction. In this context of inservice education, the motivation and the direction for learning come from the teacher, but certain enabling factors--time, money, educational resources--must be provided either by the schools or by higher education institutions.

There are, generally speaking, four modes of inservice education mentioned in the literature that take place in a self-directed context. Two of these involve the provision to teachers of free time with pay in order to allow teachers to pursue their own educational interests. The first of these is released time from classroom duties during the school week. Released time may be granted either for several hours on a given day or days or for a whole day to be devoted to inservice. Types of possible activity include workshops, conferences, research, independent study, short-range travel or field trips, and demonstrations of new methods or resources. Surveys have found that released time is looked upon favorably by teachers,[37] and the AFT has come out strongly in its favor.[38] Monitoring of inservice activities could be as tight or as loose as the school district desired. In case released time resulted in fewer school days for pupils, legislative authorization would be necessary.

The other time-based mode of inservice education in the self-directed context is the sabbatical leave. An older concept than released time, the sabbatical is much more common among college and university professors than among school teachers. Originally, the sabbatical was reckoned at one year in every seven. Now there is considerable variation from institution to institution in regard to its length, its frequency, the rate of pay (expressed as a fraction of full pay), and the requirements for eligibility. The usual activities undertaken during a sabbatical include further university courses, educational travel, research and writing, or work experience; generally some sort of plan for use of the sabbatical must be proposed and accepted. In Great Britain, the James Report concluded that an inservice sabbatical was essential:

> All teachers in schools and full-time staff in F.E. colleges should be entitled to release with pay for in-service education and training on a scale equivalent to not less than one school term (say, 12 weeks) in every seven years of service and, as soon as possible, the entitlement should be increased to one term in five years, and the entitlement should be written into teachers' contracts of service. (39)

The other methods of self-directed inservice education are general education courses and professional reading. Continuing education courses may be taken by teachers simply to satisfy their own interests and not only to earn an advanced degree or to qualify for a higher level of certification. This sort of inservice can be facilitated by schools and universities, respectively, by granting tuition and fees or by waiving or reducing them. Professional reading on teachers' own initiative is enabled through allotment of funds for teachers to purchase professional books or through establishment of professional libraries. Books are usually the primary tool of preservice education, but studies have shown that their use is relatively rare in inservice education.[40]

## THE SEARCH FOR EFFECTIVE INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

THE STATE OF THE FIELD: Given the number and variety of different methods of inservice education, and the several different contexts within which they may occur, how is one to choose among them? Where in the literature can one turn to find an overview of what is happening in inservice education or, perhaps more important, a comparative analysis of the various approaches? What answers does the research literature offer to the practitioner?

The state of the art of reviews of research on inservice education can be characterized by two statements: (1) there is very little hard research available, and (2) what does exist is not very useful. Fewer than a dozen reviews of research have been identified. This situation is without question lamentable; it is also perhaps surprising in light of the large volume of inservice literature and the importance of the field. A review of what has been done is in order, so that we may identify the current state of the field and possibly suggest future directions.

Before the state of research on inservice education is discussed in detail, two significant references must be mentioned which are not reviews of research: In-Service Education, Henry, ed. (1957),[41] and Improving In-Service Education, Rubin, ed. (1971).[42] Both of these collections of essays are among the very few works of a comprehensive nature in the literature. Henry's work is a yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education and is perhaps the basic reference for inservice education through the 1950's. It

provides a broad overview of the inservice scene: its history and psychology; suggested guidelines; the respective roles of teachers, administrators, and consultants; descriptions of local, area, state, regional, and national programs; and organization, evaluation, and training for inservice. The Rubin book, a series of penetrating essays by prominent educators, offers probably the best theoretical and conceptual background for planning future research into inservice education.[43]

The first significant review of inservice education found is a report published in 1966 by the Research Division of the National Education Association, entitled "Inservice Education of Teachers; Research Summary 1966-S1."[44] The report sets a pattern of issues discussed which is typical of later inservice reviews. Included in the report are these items: a definition of inservice teacher education; reasons why it is needed; nineteen different types of inservice teacher education; barriers to inservice teacher education (primarily from the teachers' point of view); several empirical studies of inservice teacher education with various figures and charts; a discussion of evaluation procedures; and suggestions for improving inservice teacher education. The report does provide an overview of the factual situation concerning inservice teacher education but fails to throw light on the basic question: which methods of inservice teacher education work better than others?

The next noteworthy research review of inservice education is one by Westby-Gibson of the Far West Laboratory in 1967.[45] Included in her report are both current psychological and sociological research applicable to inservice education and a survey of innovations in inservice itself. The primary research topics covered are the social setting and structure of the school, the interaction between teacher and school, and the process of change. Westby-Gibson's categorization of inservice innovations is quite forward-looking and could be used even today. Particularly prominent is her prefiguration of new cooperative approaches, new methods of feedback, new instructional media, and new roles of staff--all very important topics today. In general, this is a lucid and thorough discussion of the issues.

In the same year Asher[46] produced a review of psychological research pertinent to inservice education. After briefly discussing the history and goals of inservice education, he proceeded to elaborate principally some findings in the psychology of change, both in general and in particular, as

applied to schools. Several authors were cited on the subjects of change and innovation and of behavior modification. Very little is mentioned here about inservice education per se.

In 1969, Rubin published "A Study on the Continuing Education of Teachers,"[47] a report on a project conducted by the Center for Coordinated Education in Santa Barbara. Although it is reporting on merely one project, the study deserves inclusion among reviews of research because of the breadth of its objectives and the size of the program conducted. The results are presented discursively rather than with charts and figures, and, as a consequence, the paper is eminently readable and to the point.

Four papers published in 1971 and 1972 attempt to consolidate the cumulative research done on inservice education. Two of these deal with variables that are thought to be important in changing inservice procedures: Devore (1971)[48] and Sobol (1971).[49] Although there are some useful suggestions to be found here, these works can hardly be called compendia of hard scientific research. They consist mostly of descriptive findings from educational literature. This situation is not, however, necessarily the fault of these authors--it merely reflects the current state of research in inservice education. There is little hard research being done, and what little there is is rather sketchy.

The other two papers are a review of literature and research by Ward (1972)[50] and a survey of research and development efforts by Mohr (1971).[51] Mohr describes teacher training models at various universities, programs for teachers of the disadvantaged, and other (mostly university-based) programs; he discusses briefly technological innovations and the work of the regional educational laboratories. The bulk of Devore's work and of the two studies on variables is lists--lists of problems, of potential variables, of "research findings," and of various recommendations for all phases of inservice activities. Ward, for example, catalogues seventy-six problems[52] of inservice education and twenty-five ways[53] to motivate teachers! Sobol offers forty-two suggestions for planning and organization of inservice teacher education[54] and another twenty-seven on administrative support and financing.[55] These reviews of research are a hodgepodge, an unorganized collection of often unrelated findings and suggestions with no unifying framework. They quite resemble the state of inservice education

itself.

The only review of research found which may properly deserve the name is one conducted by Lawrence and others in 1974 for the Florida Department of Education.[56] Lawrence established a working definition of inservice programs and included only those studies which contained some sort of "validity safeguard" (evaluation). He found ninety-seven studies of programs which fit his criteria; these were analyzed according to fourteen variables. Prominent among these variables were "situational design"[57] ("the institutional context and general curriculum pattern within which the inservice education took place"), of which fifteen different types (workshop, staff meeting, etc.) were identified; "mediation"[58] ("the instructional means by which influence is brought to the participant"), of which seven kinds (books, lecture, etc.) were found; and "influence agent"[59] (the person who plays an "instructional role in the inservice activity"), of which again seven sorts (consultant, self, etc.) were listed. Lawrence also suggested seven dichotomous approaches to the management of inservice activities, for example: individualized activities vs. activities common to all; active role vs.receptive role. The outcomes reported by the programs were coded as "significant" (successful) results, "no significant difference," or "mixed" results. Lawrence then was able to assign percentages to each value of each variable and to reach some specific conclusions by comparing these figures.

Lawrence's study is still rather primitive scientifically. The most he can say is something to this effect: "Of the programs included in the survey, 'x' per cent included workshops and 'y' per cent used books;" or " 'q' per cent of the individualized programs studied achieved a significant positive result, compared with only 'r' per cent of the common-activities programs." His work is, nevertheless, a major advance over past efforts and a starting point for improving the sophistication of future research.

Two other works deserve mention before we conclude this section and proceed to a substantive discussion of the research findings. One is a review in 1975 by Edelfelt[60] of 256 entries in the ERIC system from the previous two years. This brief paper provides a good sense of what sorts of literature are being produced and what problems in inservice education are (and are <u>not</u>) being written about. Edelfelt also notes the lack of works of

a comprehensive nature and of inservice programs with an overall policy. The other work is a chapter[61] by Edelfelt and Lawrence in the NEA's Rethinking In-Service Education (1975). Largely drawn from the two works just mentioned by the same authors, the chapter includes an incisive analysis of the historical assumptions underlying traditional inservice education, a brief overview of the state of the art of inservice, and some considerations for the future.

SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS: Two conclusions drawn from a review of the literature seem to dominate the current state of inservice teacher education. One concerns the state of research on the subject; the other, the state of inservice teacher education itself. The first is that the literature has been concerned almost entirely with asking the question of what is there in new programs, to the virtual exclusion of asking why and how programs succeed or fail.[62] In other words, the process of inservice teacher education has been neglected in the research literature in favor of the content of inservice teacher education. The second conclusion is that traditional inservice teacher education programs have consisted almost entirely of information-gathering activities: attending workshops, taking college courses and institutes, reading professional journals, reading curriculum bulletins, discussing methods with other teachers, attending professional conventions.[63] Programs that stress utilization of that information or practice of techniques with feedback have been distinctly in the minority.

With these considerations in mind, let us now proceed to an examination of the more prominent findings in the literature. These findings will be grouped into two sections: the first dealing with the who, where, how, and why of inservice teacher education; the second, with choices of approach to the structure of inservice teacher education. The findings, reflecting the state of research concerning inservice teacher education, will be formulated only very roughly: qualitatively, not quantitatively; and discursively, not statistically.

WHO? There are essentially four categories of persons who generally conduct inservice teacher education programs: the teacher himself, another practicing teacher, a supervisor or administrator, and a university professor. The general trend of the literature indicates that their respective relative

success is in the same descending order as they are listed in the previous sentence.[64] A teacher, in other words, may very well be his own best change agent in properly designed inservice teacher education programs. Also very highly regarded are other practicing teachers. As Rubin puts it, "...(A) practicing teacher is the best possible trainer of teachers."[65] More traditional inservice teacher education personnel--both from the schools and from the higher education institutions--have a lower rate of success.

WHERE? Of the two primary locations considered in the literature, the school itself seems to be a better place for inservice teacher education than the higher education institution.[66] Larger schools, furthermore, seem to have a higher rate of success than smaller schools.[67]

HOW? The means of instruction in inservice teacher education does not seem to be an important variable in the effectiveness of the program,[68] with two positive exceptions. Videotape methods, especially Minicourses,[69] are generally more successful than the average;[70] and programs that employ books seem to report a high degree of success.[71]

WHY? There are several interesting findings relating the type of objective of the inservice teacher education program to its rate of success. One general conclusion is that programs aiming toward improvement of teachers' knowledge tend to be more successful than those directed toward teachers' performance, which in turn fare better than programs trying to modify teachers' attitudes.[72] Findings also indicate a high degree of success for programs that strike a measured balance between theory (knowledge) and practice (performance).[73] Despite the relatively low rate of reported success in changing teachers' attitudes, this objective is nonetheless important in inservice teacher education, as Rubin points out.[74] The emotions of teachers, as well as their minds and their behaviors, must be attended to, especially in light of the fact that professional growth through inservice teacher education has been found to breed insecurity in teachers.[75]

Another tendency noted is that success in inservice teacher education programs tends to increase as the objective of the program is increasingly more precisely specified.[76] The high success rate for Minicourses is a prime example of this trend.[77]

Two final observations deserve mention concerning the objectives of inservice teacher education programs. Changing the performance of teachers is

accomplished more often, proportionately, than changing the performance of pupils.[78] And changing the performance of a group is easier than changing the performance of an individual teacher.[79]

## APPROACHES TO THE STRUCTURE OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Lawrence's study of successful inservice teacher education programs identified seven characteristics that seem to reflect the trends in the rest of the literature.[80] A brief glimpse at these characteristics and their opposites may serve to give a composite picture of the emerging designs of inservice teacher education. It should be borne in mind that no particular program should (or perhaps even can) have all of these attributes, but that successful programs tend to have more of them than less successful ones.

(1) Individualized programs are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that have the same activities for all participants. Individualization, furthermore, should be understood not to be limited to variations merely in pace and sequence of materials.

(2) Programs in which teachers take some active role (e.g., generating a set of instructional materials) are more likely to be successful than those in which teachers are limited to a passive or receptive role.

(3) Programs based on a demonstration of materials or technique, combined with a supervised trial followed by some form of feedback, are more likely to be successful than those in which information or instructions are learned and stored for future application.[81]

(4) Programs in which teachers provide mutual assistance are more likely to be successful than those in which teachers work entirely on their own.[82]

(5) Programs occurring as part of an overall staff development plan or general effort of the school are more likely to be successful than one-shot efforts.[83]

(6) Programs of emergent design, in which teachers themselves choose at least some of the goals and activities, are more likely to be successful than programs which are entirely preplanned.[84]

(7) Programs which are self-initiated and self-designed tend to have a high rate of success.[85] Perhaps this point is, or should be, self-

evident. As Rubin asserts, "Ultimately, however, we must have teachers who are self-directive, who participate in the organization of their own self-improvement."(86)

A review of the general literature of inservice teacher education and of the past reviews of research and literature on the subject leads one inexorably to the conclusion that inservice teacher education programs in the future must be quite different from those of the past.

## REFERENCE NOTES

(1) ERIC, the national Education Resources Information Center, is operated by the National Institute of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It contains more than 100,000 items entered from 1966 to 1975. A computer search was used to locate all entries in the system in which the topic "inservice teacher training" figured prominently (or was, in ERIC terminology, a "major descriptor"): more than one thousand such entries were found and reviewed. In addition, several hundred other items were reviewed in which the topic was discussed to a lesser extent (or was a "minor descriptor").

(2) The Current Index to Journals in Education, or CIJE, a publication of the ERIC system, indexes articles from more than seven hundred periodicals which, together, represent the core of educational literature. It covers the years 1969 to 1975. A computer search yielded about six hundred articles during that period on the subject of "inservice teacher education."

(3) The Education Index was searched for articles on "inservice teacher education" for the years 1950 through 1969.

(4) Yearbooks were reviewed for the following organizations: the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), formerly the Association for Student Teaching (AST); the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD); and the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE).

(5) There was also found in the literature another category or level of generality besides the three mentioned in this paragraph. This category includes items which are not about inservice teacher education but which are (parts of) inservice teacher education: e.g., simulations, minicourses, readings for the practicing teacher. Works of this kind will not be dealt with in this review.

(6) Marvin L. Berge, Russel E. Harris, and Charles B. Walden, "In-Service

Education Programs of Local School Systems," Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, Part I, pp. 197-223. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.

(7) Research Division, National Education Association, "Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-S1." ERIC ED 022 728: 1966.

(8) Roy A. Edelfelt, "In-Service Teacher Education--Sources in the ERIC System." ERIC ED 099 308: 1975.

(9) R.N. Bush, "Curriculum-Proof Teachers," Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, pp. 37-70. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

(10) For a discussion of the Harvard-Lexington Project, see the following articles:
R.H. Anderson, "School-University Cooperation and the Lexington Project," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 34, pp. 382-86, April, 1961.
R.H. Anderson, "Team Teaching in Action," Nation's Schools, vol. 65, pp. 62-65, May, 1960.
R.H. Anderson, et. al., "Team Teaching in an Elementary School," School Review, vol. 68, no.1, pp. 71-84, Spring 1960.

(11) See, e.g., A Survey of Opinions Concerning Teacher Education in Florida, pp. 47-48. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1975. See also Rubin, op.cit. note 47 below, pp. 12-13; Edelfelt, op.cit. note 33 below, p.1.

(12) For a complete discussion of the League of Cooperating Schools and its development see:
Mary M. Bentzen and Associates, Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban, eds., The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

John I. Goodlad, The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, (1975).
David A. Shiman, Carmen M. Culver, Ann Liebermann, eds., Teachers on Individualization: The Way We Do It, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
Kenneth A. Tye, Jerrold M. Novotney, Schools in Transition: The Practitioner as Change Agent, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, (1975).
Richard C. Williams, Charles C. Wall, W. Michael Martin, Arthur Berchin, Effecting Organizational Renewal in Schools: A Social Systems Perspective, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

(13) For a discussion of caveats concerning use of outside consultants and an analysis of the different roles they can serve, see Wayne Otto and Lawrence Erickson, Inservice Education to Improve Reading Instruction, pp. 21-23. ERIC ED 080 975: 1973.

(14) Lillian G. Katz, "A Pilot Study of the Advisory Approach to Inservice Training. Final Report." ERIC ED 083 190: 1973. Lillian G. Katz, "The Advisory Approach to Inservice Training." ERIC ED 083 158: 1973.

(15) B.S. Bloom, M.D. Engelhart, W.H. Hill, and D.R. Krathwohl, eds., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: Longmans, Green, 1956.

(16) N.L. Gage, ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

(17) Herman G. Richey, "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-Service Education," Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, Part I, p. 62. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1957. Gordon Lawrence, et al., Patterns of Effective Inservice Education, p. 8. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1974.

(18) For an elaboration of the teacher center movement in the United States, please see the section on "Collaborative Arrangements," elsewhere in this review, and references cited therein.

(19) For a discussion of the most important types of teacher training products available, please see the section on "The Software Technology of Teacher Education" elsewhere in this review.

(20) Teacher Education and Training: A Report by a Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme, pp. 14-17, 108. London:Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.

(21) Sam J. Yarger, et al., A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education. ERIC ED 098 159: 1974.

(22) For a thorough discussion on the Minicourses produced by the Far West Lab, see Walter R. Borg, et al., The Minicourse: A Microteaching Approach to Teacher Education. Beverly Hills: Macmillan Educational Services, 1970.

(23) Keith A. Hall, "A Triumph for CAI," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 56, no.1, September, 1974, pp. 70-72; Keith A. Hall, "Curricular and Computer System Compatibility of CAI Programs for Multi-University Use." ERIC ED 093 322: 1973.

(24) Richey, loc. cit.

(25) In the 1970-71 school year, 27.5% of public elementary and secondary teachers held Master's or Doctor's degrees. Digest of Educational Statistics, (1974 ed.), pp. 47-48. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1975.

(26) For a persuasive argument in favor of maintaining the higher education institution as the primary center of teacher education (instead of turning over control of teacher education to the school systems), see Robert B. Howsam, "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium," John H. Hansen, ed., Governance by Consortium, pp. 21-23. Syracuse: National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974.

(27) Robert M. Wilson and Marcia M. Barnes, "Experimental Programs in an Elementary Classroom." ERIC ED 063 585: 1972.

(28) J. Alden Vanderpool, "Relationships Between Certification and 'In-Service' Education," Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, eds., Rethinking In-Service Education, pp. 57-58. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

(29) See, e.g., David Selden, "Teacher Centers: Who Should Pay and Who Should Control?" ERIC ED 090 168: 1974. Howsam, op.cit., p.11.

(30) See, e.g., Marian L. Wilson, "Inservice Educational Needs of Teachers," ERIC ED 093 896.

(31) National Education Association, "NEA Teacher Center Network: A Prospectus." ERIC ED 079 231: 1972. David Darland and David Selden, "Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?" ERIC ED 086 674: 1972.

(32) Betty Horodezky, "Raising Standards Through Competency-Based Inservice Education." ERIC ED 098 515: 1974.

(33) Roy A. Edelfelt, "Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education Through Teacher Association Negotiations. Final Report." ERIC ED 067 370: 1972.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Robert D. Bhaerman, "Quality Teaching: Some New Thoughts on AFT's Role in Inservice Education," pp. 2-3. QUEST paper no. 3, Department of Research, American Federation of Teachers.

(36) Ibid., pp. 5-7; Robert D. Bhaerman, "Several Educators' Cure for the Common Cold, Among Other Things: or, One Unionist View of Staff Differentiation," pp. 7-10. QUEST paper no. 7, Department of Research, American Federation of Teachers. Robert D. Bhaerman, "Needed: A Conceptual Framework for Collective Bargaining in Education," pp. 6-7,

10. QUEST paper no. 9, Department of Research, American Federation of Teachers.

(37) e.g., Larry Johnson, "Teacher Released Time in Minneapolis Elementary Schools: An Evaluation 1971-72." ERIC ED 084 296: 1972.

(38) The "20/20 Vision Program" proposed by David Selden, AFT President, in 1970.

(39) James Report, op.cit. (note 20), p. 107.

(40) Lawrence, op.cit., p. 10.

(41) Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, Part I. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.

(42) Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

(43) Six chapters in Rubin's book--those written by Ralph Tyler, Philip Jackson, Robert Bush, Dwight Allen, Ronald Lippitt, and Robert Fox--were actually used as the theoretical basis of Lawrence's Patterns of Effective Inservice Education, note 17 above.

(44) Research Division, National Education Association, "Inservice Education of Teachers; Research Summary 1966-S1." ERIC ED 022 728: 1966.

(45) Dorothy Westby-Gibson, "Inservice Education--Perspectives for Educators." ERIC ED 015 161: 1967.

(46) James J. Asher, "Inservice Education--Psychological Perspectives." ERIC ED 015 891: 1967.

(47) Louis J. Rubin, "A Study on the Continuing Education of Teachers." ERIC ED 036 487: 1969.

(48) Paul W. Devore, Variables Affecting Change in Inservice Teacher Education. ERIC ED 070 764: 1971.

(49) Francis Thomas Sobol, What Variables Appear Important in Changing Traditional Inservice Training Procedures. ERIC ED 083 146: 1971.

(50) William G. Ward, A Review of Literature and Research on Inservice Training for Teachers with Emphasis on Vocational and Technical Teachers. ERIC ED 073 244: 1972.

(51) Paul Mohr, Current Research and Development Efforts in Inservice Training and Curriculum Planning for Teacher Education. ERIC ED 083 148: 1971.

(52) Ward, op.cit., pp. 9-13.

(53) Ibid., pp. 14-15.

(54) Sobol, op. cit., pp. 21-25.

(55) Ibid., pp. 25-28.

(56) Lawrence, op.cit.

(57) Ibid., p.3.

(58) Ibid., p.4.

(59) Ibid.

(60) Edelfelt, op.cit. note 8.

(61) Roy A. Edelfelt and Gordon Lawrence, "In-Service Education: The State of the Art," Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, eds., Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

(62) Sobol, op.cit., p.2.

(63) Ibid., p.1.

(64) Lawrence, op.cit., pp. 11-12.

(65) Rubin, op.cit. note 47, p.9.

(66) Lawrence, op.cit., p.9.

(67) Devore, op.cit., p.14.

(68) Lawrence, op.cit., p.10.

(69) Ibid., p.9.

(70) Ibid., p.10.

(71) Ibid.

(72) Ibid., p.13.

(73) Devore, op.cit., p.14.

(74) Rubin, op.cit. note 47, p.22.

(75) Ibid., p.18.

(76) Devore, op.cit., p.15.

(77) Lawrence, op.cit., p.9.

(78) Ibid., p.13.

(79) Rubin, op.cit. note 47, pp.11-12; but cf. Devore, op.cit., p.2.

(80) Lawrence, op.cit., pp.14-17.

(81) cf. Sobol, op,cit., p.1.

(82) This finding seems to conflict with finding (7) below and also with the conclusions reached in notes 64-65 above and accompanying text.

(83) See also Devore, op.cit., p.12.

(84) See also Devore, op.cit., p.12.

(85) See also Devore, op.cit., p.12,14.

(86) Rubin, op.cit. note 47, p.3.

## COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

A variety of entities or agencies may collaborate to share responsibility for inservice teacher education. The recent literature with respect to collaboration among entities consists largely of descriptions of individual projects, occasionally with critical evaluations of the effects of those projects. The general literature is very thin indeed. Essentially, there are only two major publications: Governance by Consortium, Hansen, ed. (1974), and Rethinking In-Service Education, Edelfelt and Johnson, eds. (1975). Nearly all the rest of the literature deals with particular programs. In very few cases are these accompanied by evaluations of particular combinations tried. It is very difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of collaboration as such unless variations in degrees and types of collaboration are tried and compared. Such evaluation is very rarely the case.

### WHY COLLABORATION?

The discussion of this topic should begin by asking why there should be consortia or collaborative arrangements in the first place. The essence of the collaborative adventures of recent years has been the change in control over teacher education from the traditionally exclusive jurisdiction of higher education institutions to a concurrent jurisdiction that includes as well teachers' organizations, state departments of education, local school districts, and community representatives. There are two aspects to the reason for this movement toward shared control. The first is educational: viz., the belief that the involvement of other entities which are intimately concerned with teacher education would be likely to enhance the quality of teacher educaiton, especially in its inservice component. The other aspect is political. In other words, the movement should be seen not merely as the implementation of a new theory or philosophy of education but also as a concrete power struggle, the goal of which is to decentralize the

governance of teacher education. The state of New York provides a good example of the two aspects of the movement toward consortia. Until recently, a higher education institution could by itself apply to have its teacher education programs certified by the state. Since 1972, however, the Regents have mandated that higher education institutions affiliate with school districts and other entities in order to apply for certification of their teacher education programs. In so mandating consortia in New York, the Regents were acting partly as a result of political pressures to redistribute control and partly out of the belief that mandated collaboration would improve the educational situation.

The sources of pressure to operate collaboratively have been several. One of the major sources in recent years has been the influence of the recent English concern with the revolution in inservice education and in schooling. Specifically, two reports (the Plowden Report and the James Report) urged respectively that a more informal education be instituted throughout England and that informal teacher training centers be generated to enable teachers to prepare themselves in a mode which was consistent with that with which they were going to educate children. The Plowden Report urged that informal education (English primary education) be generally instituted throughout the United Kingdom.[1] The James report, which was an assessment of the training of teachers, both preservice and inservice, urged that the teacher centers be set up simultaneously with the move toward English informal education.[2] Charles Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom helped to popularize the English approaches toward education and teacher training in the United States and became the document around which much political pressure was generated by parents' and teachers' organizations. The teacher center movement had its ideological underpinnings in the James Report and in the translations in the United States by individuals such as Lillian Weber[3] and the officials and teachers of the Minneapolis public schools.[4]

A second source has been increased teacher militancy. Teachers have been demanding greater voice in determining their education and the education of those who follow them. The American Federation of Teachers, for example, studied the teacher center movement and presented an extensive report in an AFT Newsletter.[5] Both the National Education Association and

the American Federation of Teachers have made some modest beginnings[6] in the establishment of teacher centers in which teacher organizations play an important part.

The third force has been the general disenchantment of the public with the educational establishment. Legislators in particular (such as the New York state legislature) have begun to require that higher education institutions affiliate with school districts, teachers' organizations, and communities in the creation of collaborative inservice teacher education arrangements. To much of the public, the "establishment" of higher education personnel concerned with the preparation of teachers has resisted change and will continue to do so unless there are counterbalancing forces created which require it to pay more attention to the needs of communities and of teachers in the field.

The federal government has not been without influence in this area. Teacher Corps legislation requires that school districts, higher education institutions, and community members collaborate to present proposals for inservice education and to build organizations to carry them out. Part of the federal responsibility has come from concerns with multi-ethnic and cross-cultural education. Federal programs such as Teacher Corps are designed to assist the poor (particularly the poor belonging to the visible minorities) to learn to teach effectively persons of their heritage and others who have by reason of poverty, race, or ethnicity been disadvantaged. It is a short step from that conviction to the conclusion that higher education institutions operating by themselves have not been responsive to the needs of the poor or the minorities and that only by forcing their collaboration with communities can the institutions be required to change their practices.

The Urban/Rural Program has been an experiment in community collaboration in inservice education. The Urban/Rural legislation provides funds to councils who will be responsible for inservice education in a small geographic area. These councils include a majority of community members, although institutions of higher education, school district personnel, and teachers are also included. However, the basic assumption of the Urban/Rural Program was that by bringing about relative parity among the parties interested in teacher education a more effective and relevant program would be achieved.

In 1968, the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education established a program to develop new models of preservice education, and these were rapidly extended to inservice teacher education. The resulting models added fuel both to the movement toward competency-based teacher education and the movement to insure collaboration in the teacher education process. The Request for Proposals for the Bureau of Research models required both of these kinds of provisions, that is, that education for teachers be oriented specifically toward competencies and that there be collaboration among the interested parties in the creation of the programs.

All of these forces have converged to bring about the present scene--essentially an experimental one--in which institutions are inching gradually toward collaboration with one another, sometimes in response to a federal or state mandate and in other cases voluntarily.

The movements toward collaborative arrangements have been proceeding along parallel lines [7] in preservice and inservice teacher education, and gradually, the distinction between the two of them has been becoming blurred. It is increasingly recognized that preservice teacher education is not terminal. That is, it should not result in a lifetime certificate which does not require further training for renewal. It is further recognized that only a small amount of teacher preparation can be accomplished during the preservice years and that the bulk of teacher competence acquisition actually has to be accomplished while the person is in service. For many years, preservice teacher education operated under the assumption that fresh young blood coming into education would rapidly change it. It has turned out, rather, that forces operating in the schools and colleges have socialized the young teachers to the prevailing norms, thus subverting the idealism with which they supposedly entered their careers. It is increasingly recognized, therefore, that preservice and inservice teacher education have to be coordinated quite closely, that there can be no hard and fast line between them, and furthermore that the organizations to bring them about probably have to be parallel if not one and the same.

The orientation toward creating certification around specifically defined competencies has had a strong influence on thinking about both pre- and inservice teacher education.[8] This concern has taken two forms. One of these is that competencies be defined by a variety of relevant parties.

It is believed important that teachers, researchers, trainers of teachers, school officials, parents, other community members, state department of education officials, and specialists in the education of particular categories of children (such as the handicapped) be involved together in the definition of the competency statements which would be used to guide certification. Thus, the competency orientation itself, which sprang from technological origins (the notion particularly that training directed toward specific competencies is more efficient and can be managed by applied systems analysis) has increasingly become a vehicle through which collaborative arrangements have been promulgated. Teachers are not willing to have higher education officials alone determine competencies, nor are state officials willing to have teachers alone determine them. Everyone wants his part in the process, and nearly everyone believes that a variety of points of view will result in a better product. Second, if competency statements are to be developed collaboratively, it is a short step to the development of programs on a collaborative basis. If teachers are to help determine what competencies are the most important for them, they also will wish a share in the determination of training modalities, timing, and other kinds of arrangements. The logic here is not elaborate: an agreement to collaborate at the level of determination of program objectives would be extremely hard to embrace without the corresponding notion that training evaluation should also be created collaboratively.

WHAT ENTITIES SHOULD BE INCLUDED?

We can distinguish three kinds of entities in terms of the types of roles which they can play in collaborative arrangements to generate teacher education programs. One of these we might refer to as the direct participants. These include higher education institutions and their faculties, school districts and their administrative personnel, teachers and their organizations, and state and county departments of education and their officials. The most common collaborative arrangement involves two or more of these. State and county agencies are often unavoidably involved because they are responsible for much of the funding and, in the case of states, for the regulation of certification procedures. Higher education personnel and administrators of school districts have traditionally been the trainers of inservice teachers and the makers of their curricula. Teachers and their

organizations represent both the wisdom of the practitioner and the political power which results as he operates collectively with his peers. Together these agencies are directly responsible for the operation of consortia.

The second classification of entities is the clients of teacher education. The most direct form of client is the student of teacher education himself, and it is increasingly suggested that he participate in decisions having to do with his education and the education of inservice teachers. The second form of client is the student in school. These children in schools, increasingly it is thought, should give their opinions about teacher education. A recent major study at the Far West Laboratory[9] included student perceptions of teachers as one of the major sources of identification of skills which differentiate the effective from the less effective teacher. The third category of client is the community member or the parent, whose interest it is that the young of the community be effectively educated. In some kinds of collaborative arrangements, community members have a very prominent part, as in Urban/Rural programs and Teacher Corps programs. In others their parts are relatively nominal.

Third are entities responsible for regulating the context of teacher education, particularly regional organizations, supplementary educational centers, and technical assistance centers located in various states attempting to provide support services of various kinds. For example, the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) in New York state provide a range of inservice activities and enable school districts to gather together and pool resources in order to accomplish purposes which the school districts working individually could not manage. Another type of supporting entity operates essentially through inducement. The United States Office of Education and several of the larger foundations have had an impact on inservice teacher education by providing opportunities for grants which in the particular case we are discussing now include the responsibility for developing collaboration. Teacher Corps and the Urban/Rural Project have already been mentioned.[10] In addition the Bureau of the Handicapped funds a number of kinds of programs which require collaboration. The Kettering Foundation has for some long time funded a variety of entities with the requirement that they work collaboratively. (An outstanding example is the League of Cooperating Schools under the direction of John Goodlad, Dean of the School of Education at UCLA.) The regional laboratories and the

research and development centers essentially serve as arms of the federal government in this respect. The programs to develop Minicourses at the Far West Laboratory, for example, have involved personnel from more than a hundred school districts. The program to develop individually prescribed instruction at the Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh and the Research for Better Schools organization in Philadelphia have involved a great many teachers and their perceptions of that program and the development of inservice programs. The University of Wisconsin has developed extensive programs to help teachers learn how to reorganize their schools and to develop collaborative arrangements for evaluation.(11)

In making collaborative arrangements particular educational units can serve as definitional of the objectives of the program and the varieties of training to be employed. For example, a teacher education program can focus on the children of a particular area, the school or schools that serve them, the teachers who work with them, the community of which they are a part, or the higher education institutions, state agencies and school district officials which surround them and attempt to offer service to them. Increasingly there is a trend toward the field-based specific school or school district-oriented teacher education program. For example, in certain programs related with schools located in bilingual communities, teacher candidates and higher education faculty members are selected only when they can demonstrate that they have mastered more than one language. This is a relatively clear and dramatic case of an attempt to make the teacher education focus specifically on the problems of the community and the schools that serve it. In general, however, the trend toward field-based education has had a slow but steady increase, not only for educational reasons, but partly because higher education institutions, still having the chief responsibility for so much of pre- and inservice teacher education, prefer to work in settings where broad and deep collaborative arrangements have been established.

## THE ROLES OF THE ENTITIES

It is worthwhile to distinguish between rational and power bases for role definition although we do not imply that power is purely irrational.

Rational sources of roles are those which attempt to identify the functions that entities can best play and how they can best be coordinated. For example, it seems very reasonable to suppose that community members can

help inform teacher education planners about the needs of communities as well as their nature. Higher education institution specialists and curriculum specialists from school districts have been trained in program planning and should be able to contribute much in that domain. Teachers can help define specific competencies and also serve to train one another.

Political power bases of roles are those which derive from the application of pressure. School systems and institutions of higher education control most of the present resources of inservice education. State education agencies and the United States Office of Education frequently have the funding power to be very influential in programmed sessions. Teachers as individuals rarely have that power but as a collectivity they can virtually bring inservice teacher education to a halt if they wish (or, reciprocally, can make it a vital enterprise). Similarly community members pay the bills for schools and can create much difficulty if their wishes are not heeded. The rational basis for role allocation operates in such a way that agencies get together and consider their proper roles, rationalizing these and making plans to fulfill them. When the power base operates, agencies simply compete with one another for major parts of the decision-making turf. It is realistic to suppose that a combination of the rational-based and power-based role allocation methods would be followed. To some extent roles will be designed by negotiation and analysis and to some extent they will be defined by raw power.

## ROLE LIMITATIONS OF THE ENTITIES

In a nation as large as this one it is extremely difficult to generalize about the possibilities and limitations of the different categories of entity. State departments of education, for example, are by no means homogeneous. The sheer size of some states tends to transform their organizations. Some states have relatively small populations (for example, Wyoming) and yet cover an enormous geographical territory; this situation greatly affects the kinds of relationships that a state agency bears to its higher education institutions and school districts. That same state has only one higher education institution, which makes that institution vastly different from other state universities, and the state department is vested in a single institution, rather than in the more than one hundred in Pennsylvania and New York respectively.

Nonetheless, entities of a certain type have some features in common. State departments, for example, have broad powers to regulate certification, although they rarely exercise them in the larger cities, which essentially maintain their own quasi-state departments of education by tacit or legal agreement. The state deals with the smaller areas. States also are major sources of funding in most cases. In some states, such as Delaware, they contribute the majority of the budgets of the local school districts and provide categories within which those must be expended.

Lillian Cady has raised the interesting point that the nature of the state department's relationship to the populace of the state and its regulatory functions make it unsuited to be a partner in a consortium of any kind.(12) It might perform technical assistance, provide general funding umbrellas under which activities can take place, or even mandate that the consortium be formed in order to carry out certain kinds of activities. Cady contends, however, that the state department itself should not so much be a partner as be a regulator, negotiator, advisor, and consultant to the consortium.

> It is questionable whether the state agency can become a partner in the consortium. Although the state agency might be able to perform its leadership, regulatory, and consultant roles from within the consortium framework, it is doubtful that it could serve as mediator or guardian. A partner is not an objective observer. A partnership role simply increases the problems for the state agency in governance by consortium.
>
> If governance by consortium is required statewide for purposes of program approval, the state agency must be an active leader, mediator, consultant, and guardian. However, if governance by consortium is optional and if consortium membership may vary from program to program, the state agency's major roles will be to facilitate consortium activity and protect agency integrity. (13)

However, despite Cady's position, many states do collaborate, particularly in the early stages of projects. For example, in New York the Cite Projects were funded by New York State with the explicit understanding that the state would collaborate with various kinds of entities in order to try to build inter-entity agencies for inservice teacher education. It used its already existing network of Technical Assistance Centers (the Boards of

Cooperative Educational Service) and induced these to organize together with school districts and higher education institutions into collaborative agencies. The state's interest in seeing that such collaboration took place put it very much in the position of a collaborator, although it was also an observer, evaluator, funder, etc. However, it must be said that even in that case the state did not try to take an active role in the governance of the institutions but reserved its role to that of facilitator and regulator.

Higher education institutions are in many peoples' opinions the enigma in the present picture. Many school district personnel, teachers, and state education officials allege that higher education institutions and especially their faculties are not particularly interested in changing their roles or giving away the power that has been traditionally vested in teacher education. When it comes to program design, they are accustomed to being in the central positions. Curiously enough, however, faculty members of higher education institutions and the institutions themselves acting as entities have often advocated greater collaborative relationships.(14)

However, it is one thing to ask others to cooperate with you in a venture which you essentially control and quite another to say that you and those other entities are working together to create that institutional form in which you will work. Further, the movement toward greater field-based education requires that the trainer in the inservice teacher situation be willing to work on site away from his university colleagues and to demonstrate the practices that he recommends. Howsam's distinction (15) between the field-based and field-oriented approaches to teacher education bears on this point. Traditionally teacher education has been campus-based and has developed "relationships" with the field. Howsam believes that teacher education should be campus-based but field-oriented, with the assumption that teacher education needs to be relevant and therefore oriented toward the interests of the field, but that the discipline and rigor of the academic community is necessary in order to improve the professionalism of the education enterprise. Field-based education, on the other hand, could become conservative in a different way from campus-based teacher education, bringing the substance and process of teacher education too nearly in line with the presently felt needs of the field and neglecting a future orientation and the kinds of rigor that scholars can bring to the enterprise. Innovation has

often come to education from outside it, and the slight separation between those responsible for carrying on education and those responsible for training them could create tension which would prevent the immediate needs of the field situation from dominating the enterprise entirely.

The issue is confounded by the relationship of the education faculties to the liberal arts faculties and other staff of the higher education institutions. The education faculty generally has a status inferiority with respect to the other agencies in its institution, and is unwilling to operate against the norms of the institution as a whole. Liberal arts faculties and other professional schools generally tend with a jealous zeal their role in relation to other institutions. They feel that the somewhat "ivory tower" quality of higher education institutions is absolutely necessary to tend scholarship and to prevent the higher education institutions from being overwhelmed by what they often regard as the "pigmy" culture outside the institution. Thus the governing structures of higher education institutions have deliberately taken a campus orientation and one which makes it difficult in many cases to generate even a field orientation let alone a field-based approach to professional education. The situation in this case is no different from that in law, medicine or social work, wherein the atmosphere of the teaching hospital which is not university-based is often very different in responsiveness to direct field needs from that of the higher-institution-dominated schools of medicine.

Howsam provides a set of useful distinctions which can help prevent us from seeing the education of the employed teacher in too unitary a fashion.[16] He maintains that preservice education is largely the responsibility of a professional cadre, such as the faculty of a school of education, who devote their energy particularly to the training of the young teacher. He identifies a type of inservice education designed to help teachers to improve their skills and develop new roles as schools demand them. Curriculum innovation, for instance, almost always requires inservice education for its successful implementation, as witness the experience of the academic reform movement in the 1960's and early 1970's. Since every school is somewhat different from every other one and presumably has the responsibility for its own curriculum, each one develops a unique configuration of inservice needs which are essentially designed to maintain the institution and to improve it

along institutional directions which are selected from among various alternatives.

Howsam describes the continuing education of teachers, on the other hand, as the product of the needs for a professional to keep up with his field and improve his skills so that he is living in a fully contemporary way in terms of his profession. In this sense, continuing education is analogous to the job of a worker in any field who adapts not only to his particular situation but changes across the field itself. As new wood products are fabricated, for example, the builder who treats himself as a "professional" studies those materials and learns how to adapt them to the needs of his work. He even learns about them simply for basic professional interest. He likes to be informed. The professional teacher engages in continuing education in order to know about the best ideas of his time in his area, both for the sake of that general professional knowledge on its own terms and so that he will have a wider range of alternatives to choose from in his daily work.

This set of distinctions is similar to that created by Joyce and Weil in their paper on teacher centers,[17] when they distinguished between three sources of professional education. One of these is self-initiated and is analogous to Howsam's conception of continuing education. The teacher opts for education in terms of his perception of his own needs and his own thirst for professional knowledge. A second is colleague-oriented inservice education, in response to diagnosis from peers or supervisors about the needs of the individual to carry out his function. Perhaps this form of inservice education has reached its highest state in the surgical arm of the medical profession: surgical teams operate together, are related to diagnosticians, and are related to the courses of treatments following surgery (including possibly the autopsy), and thus are in a natural situation where peer feedback dictates the need for professional growth. Third, Joyce and Weil identify the corporate model of inservice education in which inservice needs are defined by thrusts within a school district or school and the configuration of those particular institutions.

School districts as entities in collaboration provide fiscal support, trainers (generally supervisors and helping teachers), sets of needs to be satisfied, and one of the major settings for training, the school itself. In many senses thus, the school district can conceive of itself as

essential in any type of consortium. It sees itself in the best position to define needs and as having the largest potential reservoir of trainers, and of course, as housing the clients of inservice education themselves. The school system has a variety of almost crippling limitations, however, when it engages in a corporate enterprise.[18] First of all, it is responsible to a board of education representing a particular segment of the citizenry. It often does not have the authority to mingle its funds with those of other agencies or to submit itself to governance procedures which go beyond its geographic borders. It is a delicate process to insure that boards of education among several school districts which are collaborating with higher education institutions and others maintain a proper balance between those areas which are the province of the district itself and those which are common to the several districts. There is a long history of successful negotiation of this type of problem, but the tighter money becomes, the more volatile the issue can be. Furthermore, school district budgets contain very little discretionary money--the money needed to fuel more enterprises. Nearly all of their funds are tied up in salaries, debt servicing, and the maintenance of the physical plants, including transportation.[19]

In addition, school districts are the closest to immediate political pressure. This pressure expresses itself first in the attempt to keep costs down and second in the attempt by segments of the public to work their will on the schools, to make them more responsive to them. The school district can be a very unreliable collaborator in the sense that community interest can rise suddenly and reduce the base of political commitment within a very short period of time. Finally, school districts tend to be concerned with their own day-to-day needs, which returns us to Howsam's earlier point about the role of higher education institutions in the inservice process. The school system can be easily so caught up in the day-to-day that it fails to advocate an inservice education designed to improve the institution. Improving the institution means changing it, and changing it affects the functions of personnel who have become accustomed to roles in which they are comfortable and in which their spheres of influence are fairly well defined and protected.

Teachers' organizations represent the collected political power and the collected wisdom of the practitioner himself. There is little question about the need for the basic involvement of these entities in any

kind of collaborative arrangement today. However, the professional organizations have been very slow to develop platforms on inservice education.[20] Collective bargaining has dealt with issues such as salary, working conditions, and definitions of professional roles. It is very easy for organizations which represent the collective interests of any given group to develop relatively mercenary programs of action which can even have very conservative effects. For example, in recent contracts arrived at in collective bargaining in several sections of the country, the "right" of school officials to convene inservice meetings has been severely curtailed. In some cases school officials are limited to no more than an hour a week, and in some cases an hour a month for coordination meetings, let alone for inservice education.

Thus all of the entities have something to contribute to consortia but each has certain kinds of shortcomings under the present conditions.

## THE EMERGING DEFINITIONS OF PARITY

The shibboleth of the trend toward collaborative arrangements in teacher education is parity. When Task Force '72 of the U.S. Office of Education identified five national problems in teacher education, one of them was the trichotomy that separates school from university from community. One of three related problems also cited by the Task Force was the "lack of parity" among participant entities in the development, implementation, and evaluation of teacher education programs.[21] What, then, is parity in the governance of teacher education? Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (2d college ed.) defines parity as "the state or condition of being the same in power, rank, value, etc.; equality." Much of the literature speaks of "parity cooperatives" or "parity boards" without attempting to define the terms. The result of this semantic looseness is a large degree of confusion, in which for every author and for every project the word takes on a different, if not exactly specified, meaning. Other writers, on the other hand, attempt an a priori definition of parity, and the result is just as useless.

In his landmark report on competency-based education, Rosner eschews defining parity and instead speaks in terms of its effects.

> Parity effects change in teacher education by including representatives from the lay public,

> school administration, teacher associations, university liberal arts and education faculties, and students in teacher education on an advisory board influencing the governance of teacher training programs. The board would assist in the development of policy governing both school and university based components of the teacher education program. This modification of policy formulating procedures tends to assure the responsiveness of teacher training to the publicly expressed objectives and priorities of the school and community. (22)

Rosner's model of parity is a cooperating board which has advisory powers and which includes representatives from the various constituencies concerned with teacher education. The idea here is to make teacher education better by making it responsive to inputs from various entities. Standing in contrast to this conception of parity is one which sees it as a process which is inherently dialectical--a battleground for resolving conflicts between the involved entities. According to this conception, parity means "the opposite of authoritarian decision-making."(23) It necessarily requires recognizing "the reality and validity of conflict and controversy; it requires arenas and procedures in which conflicts can surface and be constructively continued or resolved."(24) The objective of achieving parity in this conflict-oriented sense is not so much to improve teacher education by increasing the information input as to assure the fairness and credibility of school decisions on the basis of guaranteed participation by the various entities. This model is essentially a juristic one. Assuming the existence of a proper, agreed-upon dispute-resolving mechanism and the input into that mechanism of the stances of the various entities, each entity will have had its "day in court" and will be obliged to stand by the outcome.

Most writers on collaborative arrangements favor the principle of parity in the governance of teacher education, whether or not they attempt to define the term. One strain in the literature, however, is decidely opposed to parity. This is the strain represented by various of the teacher organizations that favor teacher-controlled institutions instead of shared control. David Selden of the AFT puts the matter this way: "...(W)e do not believe 'parity' in a governing or operating equality sense can have practical meaning in teacher center governance."(25) Selden believes that teachers should be given full authority over the control of institutions

established for their continuing education, although he concedes that the stimulation from advisory input of other interested parties would be beneficial.

Perhaps the solution to the objection that Selden raises lies in defining parity--or rather in not defining parity--beyond simply saying that it entails broad participation, in some manner,in decision-making processes by the entities concerned with those decisions. Parity should be situationally determined, according to the program involved, the decisions to be made, the entities involved, the time and resources available, and the legal constraints present.(26)

Parity, then, should not be taken to mean absolute and literal equality in all areas of teacher education. Consider, for instance, the certification process. Traditionally, state departments of education have been responsible for certification. Higher education institutions have been delegated the authority for the definition of competence by many states over the last half century. As more parties become involved, complex processes have to be developed to accomodate them. For example, the state of Florida took the stance that teachers, higher education officials, and others should participate in the definition of competence. Surveys were made of teachers to determine what competencies they thought necessary to certification. The resulting list of competencies is now well over three thousand items in length. It is not, furthermore, an orderly or organically related set of competencies. Since the suggestions were produced by many people throughout that state, their different points of view are represented, and competencies which even conflict with one another are stated in the present Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies.(27) This is a difficult problem. For one school faculty to analyze the needs and suggest the primary training objectives is a manageable political process. For all of the teachers throughout a state and representatives of the other entities as well to determine reasonable sets of competencies for certification is an incredibly complex process.

Certification is one area where differential roles among entities might make the greatest sense. The state might become responsible for coordination and evaluation of the objectives which are accepted for certification. Teachers might serve on screening committees to select and recommend priority areas. Higher education officials and faculty and task

forces representing the other entities might work on the hard technical problems of creating reasonable competency statements.

There are probably very few cases in which a completely equivalent participation by all entities would be desirable. It is sometimes assumed that parity would mean complete egalitarian participation in all facets of decision-making and implementation of the programs of inservice education. The failure to recognize the differential strengths and liabilities of various entities could result in extremely unrealistic projects.

## TEACHER CENTERS AND CONSORTIA

Although most of the literature dealing with teacher centers is, like the literature on other topics of collaborative arrangements, primarily a series of reports on individual projects, there is a significant amount of work of a more general nature done in this field. Three works in particular stand out: Yarger (1974), DeVault (1974), and Joyce and Weil (1973).

Yarger's study attempts a comprehensive empirical survey of all existing programs that are in the nature of a teacher center, which he defines as "A place or places where a program exists that offers educational personnel (inservice teachers, preservice teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, etc.), the opportunity to share, to have access to a wide range of resources, and to receive training."[28] The study includes data from almost six hundred programs and categorizes them according to variations in demography, nature of program, administration and governance, and finance. Joyce and Weil's work is much shorter and more conceptual in orientation. After discussing the characteristics and objectives that seem to be common to all teacher centers, they proceed to delineate three different "styles," with several specific examples of each. DeVault's piece is neither so exhaustive empirically as Yarger's nor so comprehensive conceptually as Joyce and Weil's, but it is useful because of the international breadth of its case studies: several centers each from England, Japan, and the United States are described. In the brief introduction to the American section, there is a rather crude but nevertheless interesting typology of a dozen different varieties of teacher centers.

What, then, do teacher centers and consortia have to do with one another? There is a difference of opinion on this point. Joyce and Weil

maintain that almost all teacher centers surveyed on the basis of their review of the literature are run by a consortium.[29] DeVaney, on the other hand, lists "consortium centers," wherein school and university personnel cooperate, as only one of twelve different kinds of centers.[30] However, his categories are not mutually exclusive, and several of the others of them are manifestly the sort of teacher centers in which collaboration not only exists but is necessary.[31] Yarger is more specific in his analysis. He identifies three categories of teacher center for the purpose of analyzing data concerning them: those sponsored by school districts; those sponsored by colleges or universities; and a residual category, those not included in the first two, which he calls the "select sample." According to Yarger's data, 35% of the school-affiliated centers are run by consortia; the percentage increases with the university category to 55%, and even more with the select sample, to 74%.[32]

The apparent discrepancy among the three sources can probably be explained as a result of divergent definitions (and hence sampled populations) of "teacher center" and of what it means to be "run" by a "consortium." A search of the literature does seem to bear out Joyce and Weil's contention: the trend is definitely toward governance by consortium, at least among those centers that are large or important enough to be reported in the literature. These tend to have one or more of the following characteristics: (1) funding by federal or state government, (2) sponsorship by a private foundation, (3) affiliation with one or more higher education institutions, and (4) location in or near a large city or large school district.

Certain other tendencies are also indicated both by Yarger's data and by certain of the fugitive literature. The inclusion of private and parochial schools as partners into a consortium-run teacher center is one relatively common occurrence that is usually not foreseen by the general writers on the subject.[33] Other consortium partners that are not usually anticipated include mental health clinics [34] (in conjunction with school-district-initiated teacher centers) and community welfare agencies such as those generated in Model Cities programs[35] (generally with university or independent centers). School-based consortium centers tend to have boards whose powers are only advisory, whereas university and independent centers are more likely to have boards with actual policy-making powers.[36]

If in fact a consortium of entities should be created to establish a teacher center--and this seems to be increasingly the trend--then there are at least three distinct levels of governance that can be distinguished. The first involves the creation and general policy which enables the funding of inservice teacher education centers. States, school districts, and higher education institutions control most of the funding presently available in the inservice area and the boards of those institutions have to agree if they are to collaborate in the creation of any kind of center. Teachers, community members, and even students can be involved in the creation of input for those decisions, but the funding authority is legally vested in boards of one sort or another, and they must agree to collaborate if there is to be any kind of consortium among them. The first decision they have to make is what kinds of inservice teacher education center will be enabled to come into existence and which entity will contribute what sorts of funds toward their operation and maintenance. Subsidiary sets of questions have to do with the regulation of centers once they are brought into existence and the kinds of and provision for technical assistance and governance procedures within them. A second level of governance is to bring an inservice center into existence and to maintain its operation. This governance, while it may require the assent of state agencies and state teacher organizations, becomes a much more local affair. Given the possibility of receiving certain amounts of state funds, local agencies need to decode how much of their own funds to put into the situation and how to set up the organization and get it going and keep it going.

Finally there is governance within the institution itself with respect to the authority of the institution in relation to particular teachers. The teacher center governance can be organized so that teachers relate to it voluntarily, so that they relate to it on a periodic but mandated base, or some combination of the two.[37] If the consortium does not provide, at the local level, for governance in relation to the individuals who are the clients of the center, then participation is likely to become entirely voluntary by default.[38]

The creation of a consortium does not necessarily mean that inservice teacher education must change substantively or in process. The presently existing set of courses from a higher education institution can move from governance within that institution with only the assent of the state depart-

ment to a governance situation in which school officials, teachers, the state department, and higher education institutions and faculty all collaborate to determine the courses which will be offered and the arrangements which would relate teachers to them. However, a consortium can result in the creation of a completely new type of institution.

An example of the new type is a teacher-operated teacher center generated to replace existing inservice courses by supervisors and higher education faculty. The situation is confounded by the fact that there are so many ways of delivering inservice teacher education.[39]

Inservice education can be accomplished through courses, short workshops, consultations with teachers on site, informal teacher centers, instructional systems which deliver service to teachers (such as Minicourses), and by infusing "helping" teachers and supervisors into the context of the teaching situation. For example, when one school district moved toward a team teaching operation it generated a dozen teams, assigning to them four supervisors who float from team to team providing help on site. The roles, responsibilities, and costs are completely different from those in which that same district surveys teachers' needs and generates a series of workshops conducted by outside consultants in order to fulfill those needs.

The point that changes in governance structure need not produce innovation cannot be overstressed. Several of the nation's largest school districts have extremely extensive teacher education programs funded and operated by the school district (Los Angeles, Montgomery County, Maryland). In most cases the offerings strongly resemble continuing teacher education courses from institutions of higher education and in some cases are taught by the same personnel, or by their opposite numbers on the supervisory staff of the school district. On the other hand, innovation can be brought about without consortium, but it seems more and more unlikely that this will be the case in the future.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), Vol I. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

(2) Teacher Education and Training: A Report by a Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.

(3) Lillian Weber, The English Infant School and Informal Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

(4) Kenneth R. Howey, "Minneapolis Public Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center: In-Service Training for Open Classroom Teachers," in Creative Authority and Collaboration, the fourth report of this series.

(5) See article by Bruce R. Joyce on Teacher Centers in the AFT Newsletter.

(6) David Selden, "Teacher Centers: Who Should Pay and Who Should Control?" ERIC ED 090 168, 1974.

David Selden and David Darland, "Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?" ERIC ED 086 674, 1972.

"NEA Teacher Center Network: A Prospectus." ERIC ED 079 231, 1972.

(7) See M. Vere DeVault, Teacher Centers in Japan, England, and the United States: A Series of Case Studies, p. 78. ERIC ED 093 856, 1974.

(8) Benjamin Rosner, et al., The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Report, ch. 5. ERIC ED 069 618, 1972.

(9) The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES), David Berliner, Director. Conducted by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, for the State of California, 1975.

(10) e.g., Teacher Corps and the Urban/Rural Program, mentioned above.

(11) See, e.g.: "A Nuclear Design for Teacher Education." ERIC ED 073 113, 1971.

(12) Lillian V. Cady, "Governance by Consortium, or Who's in Charge Here?" Governance by Consortium, John H. Hansen, ed., pp. 26-28. National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974.

(13) Ibid., p. 28.

(14) See, e.g.:
Warren C. Lovinger, "Teacher Education: A Shared Responsibility," Freedom with Responsibility in Teacher Education (17th Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), pp. 4-6. Chicago: AACTE, 1964.

C.W. Friedman, "Looking at the Association," Strength Through Reappraisal (16th Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), pp. 61-62. Chicago: AACTE, 1963.

Donald P. Cottrell,"Association Policies for the Future," Teacher Education for the Future (12th Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), pp. 62-65. Chicago: AACTE, 1959.

(15) Robert B. Howsam, "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium," Governance by Consortium, John H. Hansen, ed., pp. 22-23. National Consortium of Competency-Based Centers, 1974.

(16) Ibid., pp. 18-19.

(17) Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil, Concepts of Teacher Centers. ERIC ED 075 375, 1973.

(18) See generally the discussions in Roy A. Edelfelt, ed., Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1975.

(19) Bruce Joyce and Greta Morine, The Roots of Humanity: An Introduction to Education, Ch. 4. Boston: Little Brown and Company, in press.

(20) For some examples of inservice development done by teachers' organizations, see Roy A. Edelfelt, Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education Through Teacher Association Negotiations: Final Report. ERIC ED 067 370, 1972.

(21) Ibid., p. 5.

(22) Rosner, op. cit., p. 99.

(23) From the Administration and Supervision Task Force, Improvement and Reform in American Education: The Administration and Supervision Viewpoint. Unpublished report to William L. Smith, Deputy Commissioner for Development, United States Office of Education, June, 1973, as quoted in James R. Tanner, "The Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium--Will It Fly?" Governance by Consortium, John H. Hansen, ed., p. 57 and note 39. National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974.

(24) Ibid.

(25) Selden and Darland, op. cit., p. 10.

(26) Administration and Supervision Task Force, loc. cit.

(27) The Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies, Florida Department of Education, 1973.

(28) Sam J. Yarger, et al., A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education, p. 13. ERIC ED 098 159, 1974.

(29) Joyce and Weil, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

(30) DeVault, op. cit., pp. 79-81.

(31) Ibid.

(32) Yarger, op. cit., p. 55.

(33) Ibid., p. 54.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid.

(37) See:

Yarger, op. cit.

Robert Bhaerman, "An Inservice Education Checklist," American Teacher, March, 1974, pp. 11-12.

(38) This problem raises the issue of incentives in inservice education. See our discussion of this issue elsewhere in this review.

(39) For an elaboration of the contexts and methods of inservice education, see our section on that topic elsewhere in this review.

## VALUE ORIENTATIONS TOWARD INSERVICE EDUCATION

It is not surprising that in inservice education (as in almost all other areas of education) there has arisen a set of schools of thought about the nature of teaching and the kind of training that best facilitates its development. Up to this point, there is no general literature about alternative philosophies, but they can be discerned relatively clearly in the literature.

These philosophies of teaching and inservice education are not the product of pure analytic thinking, although they have been influenced by philosophers and psychologists whose views are reasonably clarified. In general, they have grown by small increments and pragmatic additions over the years and are manifested in programs rather than philosophical treatises. Nonetheless, they represent real views of man and the differences among them have implications for the real world as well as for educational theory. The three chief value orientations see teaching:

(a) as an act of mutual development and self-discovery.

(b) as program implementation.

(c) as skill and knowledge.

### TEACHING AS MUTUAL SELF-DISCOVERY

Perhaps the chief exponent of this position has been Arthur Combs.[1] Like Rogers[2] and Maslow,[3] Combs sees the teacher primarily as a human being who is attempting to actualize himself and whose primary goal is to help his student find his way through life and develop a "fully functioning" personality. He stresses the uniqueness of the individual and the special configurations of elements which make him what he is. Teaching is a process of facilitating each individual's discovery of himself and the means necessary to increase his understanding of himself and others. Precisely because of the

uniqueness of each teacher and each learner, each teaching transaction is a special event. The two personalities (teacher and learner) struggle to actualize themselves with the teacher in the role of facilitator and the learner in the role of facilitatee, but with an obligation on both sides to reach out and capitalize on the configurations of the other's personality.

The antecedents of person-oriented philosophical and psychological positions reach well into the past, although not until Rousseau do we have a complete articulation of a stance that the individual human being is the basic unit of humanity and that education should facilitate his unfolding and "natural" goodness, rather than impose the experience of his more experienced (and corrupt) elders. Although themes of personalism are evident in Horace Mann and Henry Barnard in America and in Herbart and Froebel in Europe, it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that a community of educators emerged to give personalism an institutional focus in the child study movement. Since that time, personalists have appeared with increasing frequency from several disciplines and with a number of shadings of concern.

From clinical psychology,[4] individual psychology,[5] Gestalt psychology,[6] and personalistic psychology,[7] have come strands of thought that have represented a very strong reform effort in the literature--one of the best-defined lines of writing--which have only occasional, but nonetheless dramatic, implementation in schooling and in teacher education.

The stance toward the student stresses his uniqueness and the importance of his emotional makeup. Individual psychology and Gestalt theory both stress the importance of the personal perceptual field. Peering at the world from his unique perspective, the student creates his reality and makes his world meaningful. His relations with others are characterized by a continuous process of negotiation of frames of reference as he seeks to express his perspective and to comprehend his neighbor's view. The unique configuration of self controls the kinds of life activities which are perceived as possible and the kinds of learning which are accessible.

From this stance one does not presume to <u>teach</u>. He provides an environment characterized by diversity and malleability--one from which the learner can choose and also which he can shape to conform to his personal configurations. The curriculum is not planned in the sense that objectives

are set and learning activities are organized in advance. Rather, the teacher gently helps the student to reflect on himself and negotiates goals with him.

When this view finds expression in the design of a school, the result is markedly different from the norm. Summerhill, for example, is delineated not only by what it focuses on, but also by what it avoids. Neill (the creator of Summerhill) believed that personal development should not be subverted by a structured curriculum, no matter how well-intentioned. The school avoids imposing on the student and gives primacy to his emotional life.(8)

If the student is unique, what of the teacher? The teacher educator who emphasizes the uniqueness of the child and the importance of his emotionality must do the same for the teacher. His education, too, has to be a process of freeing his personality and helping to develop himself on his own terms. The act of teaching has to be seen as an interaction between two selves, teacher and learner, neither superior nor inferior, in which the more experienced serves as the gentlest sort of guide.

The stance is not compatible with standardized specifications of competency for the teacher. Since the actual transactions of teaching will be the product of unique personalities responding to unique circumstances and forming what has to be a special relationship, needed competence cannot be forecast. It is idiosyncratic. The effort of the teacher educator has to focus on the development of a rich, many-sided, actualizing self rather than on training the teacher in specific skills which will be shared with other teachers.

The chief spokesman for the personalistic education of teachers has been Combs.(9) The idiosyncratic nature of teaching is seen in Combs' skepticism about the struggles to identify common teacher competencies. He prefers to emphasize the personal character of good teaching.

> A good teacher is primarily a unique personality. If good teachers are unique individuals, we can predict from the start that the attempts to find common uniqueness would be unlikely to get results....A good teacher is first and foremost a person and this fact is the most important and determining thing about him. He has competence to be sure, but not a common set of competencies like anyone else. (10)

Combs believes that the attempt to define sets of teacher competencies leads to a mechanistic conception of the teacher, and he would replace standardization with a view of the unique self as the instrument of professional behavior. "We may define the effective teacher formally as a unique human being who has learned to use himself effectively and efficiently to carry out his own and society's purposes in the education of others."(11) This view differs sharply from the position that the teacher should be taught a repertoire of competencies which he applies in order to adapt what he does to individual and purpose. From Combs' stance each individual develops his repertoire in his unique way, a necessity due to the perceptual basis of behavior.

> The basic concept of perceptual psychology is that all the behavior of a person is the direct result of his field of perceptions at the moment of his behaving. More specifically his behavior at any instant is the result of (1) how he sees himself, (2) how he sees the situations in which he is involved, and (3) the interrelationships of these two. (12)

To develop a change in behavior a person has to change his perception. Any significant change in behavior involves a change in the perceptual field. Thus, the individual self has to be the focus of education, including teacher education. A person's adjustment and perception, his interpersonal relations, and his ability to educate himself all come from his views of himself. Thus Combs concerns himself much less with the discipline-derived substance of teacher education (particularly the details of the substance) than do other approaches but deals rather with what is done to help the teacher develop his views of himself as a person and as a teacher. It is not that Combs believes that the teacher does not need to achieve competency and knowledge, but that he believes these will develop only in relation to his views of himself as a person and a professional rather than being the product of an imposed curriculum.

Combs assumes that each person is striving to fulfill himself as best he can, that he is filled with energy that expends itself on self-maintenance and self-enhancement.

> It is not the physical self that each seeks to maintain, however. It is the self of which we are aware, our self concepts, we seek fulfillment for. Even behaviors which at first glance seem to be self-destructive turn out to be self-maintaining or enhancing when they are seen from the point of view of the individual. So it is that the hero may give himself up to certain death rather than see

himself a coward or a traitor to his fellows. In our own experience we often place our physical self in jeopardy for the sake of enhancing our concepts of self. For example, we drive too fast, eat too much, work too hard even when we know better.

The need for adequacy is the fundamental motivation of every human being from conception to death...his drive towards health does not have to be learned; it is a characteristic of life itself and provides the motor power for every human act.

This drive has a tremendous implication for education. Its existence means it is not necessary to motivate people--a problem we have often struggled with. Everyone is always motivated to be and become as adequate as he can be in the situations as he sees them. Students may not be as motivated as their teachers would like, but they are always motivated in terms of their own basic need.

Knowledge of this innate drive changes the whole structure of the educative process from that which our ancestors felt was essential....The task of the teacher is not one of prescribing, making, molding, forcing....The role of the teacher is that of facilitator, encourager, helper, assistor, colleague and friend of his students. (13)

Thus, the teacher has to develop the capacity to engage in a helping relationship, one which includes the ability to relate to people and help them in such a way as to enhance them on their own terms. A teacher needs to orient himself so that the focus of much of his own fulfillment is through helping students enhance themselves. The process of teaching is a completely idiosyncratic one, depending on the individual character of the teacher as he interrelates with the individual character of the student. This is why Combs says that we cannot specify the competencies of a teacher, that competencies stem from the unique way in which the individual teacher develops a helping relationship with his unique students. Since teaching depends on making contact between the two participants, each on his own terms, the primary competence is the ability to understand one's self and to learn to understand others.

To train a teacher one must help him develop, first an adequate self; second, reliable ways of perceiving others and their goals; and third, the ability to learn substance when it is needed. To prepare such a teacher we must provide a helping relationship for the teacher-candidate just as he must provide one for his students. The best teacher education then is an environment conducive to self-actualization for two reasons which interact with each other. It is the best way of helping the teacher develop an adequate self and also it is the best way to help him learn how to help others.

If we take this stance, teacher education has to be a process of self-discovery. The setting can be a context in which self-discovery is facilitated (such as an open-ended teacher center). Helping teachers or consultants can be provided to him to help the teacher reflect on himself, clarify his goals and select the ways to achieve them which best fit his personality. The role of the consultant, however, would not be to direct the teacher's inservice education but to help him to clarify the alternatives and ways of reaching them.

Because the environment for each learner should be unique and tailored to his needs,the teacher continually finds himself in need of new ways of relating to students and new skills for handling material. There can, with this view, be no set curriculum of inservice education. There can be mutual activity by teachers (they have many problems in common). Combs' stance has been applied in a number of cases to the development of inservice activities. The philosophy expressed by Morris Cogan[14] is not antithetical to it and the techniques of supervision which were developed by Cogan, Goldhammer, and Anderson[15] appear to fit this philosophy fairly well although they do not express the phenomenological position as directly or sharply as Combs does.

## TEACHING AS CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Educational planning results in curriculums, i.e. in definitions of substance for students to explore and methods for facilitating that exploration. Curriculums are created in order to provide organizational structure for the educational experience. The curriculum outlines the substance and process of schooling. An enormous amount of time is expended annually in the creation of curricular approaches and the materials that will support them.

The curriculum maker attempts to heed Alfred North Whitehead's dictum:

> Let the main ideas which are introduced into a child's education be few and important, and let them be thrown into every combination possible. The child should make them his own, and should understand their application here and now in the circumstances of his actual life. From the very beginning of his education, the child should experience the joy of discovery. The discovery which he has to make is that general ideas give an understanding of that stream of events which pours through his life, which is his life. (16)

Thus the curriculum planner attempts to answer Tyler's four questions: What should be the objectives of the school? What experiences are likely to facilitate the achievement of these objectives? How should these experiences be organized? What means of evaluation should be employed?[17] Seen this way, teaching is a collegial activity in which teachers work together (albeit in many cases in separate classrooms) to bring about the implementation of the organized curriculum plan.

From this stance teacher education programs are generated to facilitate teachers' exploration of the substance of knowledge in the curricula and the methods to implement them. Workshops and courses over subject matter, curriculum materials and methods are the primary methods which are used with this type of approach. This approach probably reached its peak during the academic reform movement from the mid 1950's until about 1970 when local curriculum reform efforts were aided by the National Curriculum Projects in the academic subjects. These projects sponsored workshops, courses in colleges and demonstrations within the public school setting.

In the 1950's and 1960's, the academic community[18] rose up and unified itself, albeit hardly in a mood of radical social reform. It obtained large appropriations from the National Science Foundation and the academic wings of the U.S. Office of Education. It capitalized on the Russian achievements with Sputnik and the subsequent widespread criticism of education to generate a large-scale reform movement which dominated the headlines of innovation in American education from about 1955 to 1965.[19] Scholar-led projects in the sciences, mathematics, social studies, English and foreign languages created materials for children built around the ideas and methods of the academic disciplines. Large-scale programs were launched to train teachers to implement the new curricula. In these programs great prominence was given to the information-processing power of the academic disciplines. The effort was focused on conceptual capacities of man and the potential contribution of scholarly concepts to improvement of his life. The movement clearly intended to make academic thought more intelligible to the citizen and to prepare more students for a life of scholarship. The teacher was to be the surrogate of this process, although in many cases he was prepared to use "teacher-proof" materials rather than to lead the children directly.

A conference which marked the beginning of the movement resulted in

the popularization of the term "the structure of the discipline." The four advantages cited by Bruner in The Process of Education[20] for organizing instruction around the central concepts of the academic disciplines are a good basis from which to infer the view of man which is embodied in the academic reform movement:

(1) Organizing teaching around the structure of the disciplines would increase memory by providing the student an ideational scaffolding with which to organize and retain information.

(2) It would give him greater comprehension, and greater intellectual power by providing unifying ideas to help him comprehend his world.

(3) The major concepts would increase the transfer of education to problem-solving situations by providing an intellectual structure for thinking about problems.

(4) The education of the child would be brought closer to the forefront of knowledge. He would be learning the same types of concepts which advanced scholars use rather than distillations and assertions far removed from the ideas that drive advanced technique.

The view deemphasizes emotion. Nowhere in The Process of Education are the emotions of the student discussed except for the assumption that knowledge is itself intrinsically motivating. The acts of knowing and of increasing comprehension were seen as so satisfying that the student, once exposed to ideas of quality, would be motivated to continue to educate himself. The scholars saw children as they saw themselves.[21]

In his book on verbal learning, Ausubel portrays the mind of a child as an information processing system and represents fairly well the dominant psychology behind the academic orientation.[22] His stance toward learning derives from the assumption that the academic disciplines are composed of hierarchically ordered concepts and that the task of education is to transmit the hierarchy into the student's mind so that he will use it to process information. The belief that the mind is analogous to an information-processing system and the assumption that information-processing systems can be internalized by learners, give a distinctive picture of man. These views give rise to a particular kind of educational objective (internalization of the structures of academic knowledge) and thus result in an advocacy of that objective.

The abstractness of the much-touted curriculum Man, A Course of

Study illustrated rather dramatically the academic frame of reference toward the social studies and the role of the teacher which is derived from it. The curriculum is aimed towards the upper elementary grades, especially the fifth grade, and replaces a curriculum which emphasizes the history of the values of the American culture and the evolution of the political and economic systems. The topics of man as a course of study are sharply different from the studies of the American constitution and the expansion of the United States which was emphasized in the traditional fifth grade curriculum. Man, A Course of Study begins with the study of the salmon, a creature whose behaviors are almost entirely genetically derived, and then proceeds to the study of the herring gull, a creature whose behavior is largely innate but who obtains some social learning and has a minimal communication with other members of the species. From the herring gull the study proceeds to the baboon, a creature with some social life and a much larger degree of social learning. From there it proceeds to the Bushman of the Kalahari Desert and the Netsilik Eskimo. These represent human cultures which, although primitive, derive or transmit most of their behaviors socially. The student, studying the distinction between innate and learned behavior, will presumably arrive at the concept of culture. He will thus begin to get greater insight into his own behavior and come to understand the social nature of human life.

The curriculum in Man, A Course of Study emphasizes an almost pure form of scientific inquiry far separated from the contemporary social issues which wracked the world in which it was produced. A greater contrast to the progressive mode could hardly be imagined. Small wonder that the academic reform movement bypassed the education professors, so many of whom were involved in social reform.

There was a split between those advocates of the information-processing metaphor who, like Ausubel, favor reception learning, in which the learner receives concepts in verbal form, and those who believe that the student should be taught by the inductive methodologies (the "inquiry" methods) which characterize the work of scholars themselves.(23) Thus two kinds of curricula arose, one emphasizing reception learning and the other the "practice" of inductive methodology. These were paralleled by an analogous pair of approaches to teacher education. Both branches, however, emphasized cognitive processes. The academic reform movement was in no small measure responsible for the

resurgence of interest in cognitive psychology which began in the 1950's and continues to the present. The rediscovery of Piaget by American psychologists, given the frame of reference of the academic disciplines, made it almost inevitable that the emphasis on teaching and the structure of the disciplines, would be succeeded by attempts to improve cognitive processes directly. Hence there arose, especially in primary education, many programs for children based on extrapolations from Piagetian theory. These centered on the attempt to teach cognitive processes directly and to accelerate the development of logical thinking in children. (24)

Most often the view of the teacher that derived from the academic stance was that of the logician and academic scholar. This view was perhaps most eloquently expressed in the handbooks which Schwab and his associates wrote for the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study.(25) Schwab very clearly felt that it would not be possible for a teacher to teach biology effectively unless he also practiced it. It would not, of course, be necessary for him to be a prize-winning scholar, but he should have the kind of intellectual interests that would lead him to explore the modes of inquiry of the discipline and to apply them to the solution of those problems in which he was interested himself. Thus the academic reformers emphasized a mode for training the teacher through which he would become a practicing member of the discipline. He would subsequently induct his students into the practice of the discipline by expressing the concepts of the discipline in an Ausubelian manner or by leading the children in the practice of the discipline in the "inquiry-oriented" manner.

The two branches of the academic reform movement--that favoring reception learning and the one favoring inductive or process-centerd learning--are reflected in the training programs which were developed for teachers. Most of these training programs exposed teachers to courses on the discipline. They were taught in a largely didactic manner and taught teachers rather directly how to use the new curriculum materials that were being developed. Often substantive and methods courses were correlated. For example, courses on the structure of methematics appeared in the curriculum to prepare elementary teachers. Those who favored the deductive methodologies tended to try to produce teacher-proof materials, that is, materials which would by-pass the poorly regarded teacher and bring a more academic learning directly to the student. They favored teaching the teacher directly how to use the materials designed

for children. Some of these materials actually attempted to encourage the student's inductive learning by developing intricate specifications within the learning packages. The teacher, simply by following the directions, was expected to help students achieve a high level of inductive activity. Those favoring inductive activity tended to try to teach the teacher the essence of induction.

Perhaps the most pure example of a curriculum to prepare teachers to use inductive methods was developed at the University of Chicago during the early 1960's. Much of the teacher candidates' work was in the academic disciplines. A coordinator for each subject area taught children in the University Laboratory School, conducted academic research in the discipline, and was expected to generate original research in his area of concentration. The teacher candidate served an apprenticeship with the coordinator and also in an academic high school. Thus the teacher was being trained to be scholarly in his field, was being taught directly by someone who could practice the discipline, and was expected to learn to use materials designed to teach students to practice it also.

It is not surprising that very few of the students from the Chicago program (and many of the other Master of Arts in Teaching programs which were similarly designed) worked in inner city schools, or, indeed, in any but the college preparatory curricula in secondary schools. Both the curricula and the teacher training generated by the academic reform movement were almost necessarily developed for the academically talented, although there were some exceptions. The intellectual scholar, not surprisingly, was oriented toward the education of the intellectually gifted student, the prototype of which was probably his own child.

The academic reform movement viewed man as an information-processing creature. It tried to orient teachers and children toward the academic disciplines. Both its deductive and inductive branches created materials for children which assumed the teacher to be the surrogate of the disciplines. The Progressives emphasized the role of the teacher as a democratic leader of a problem-solving group and cast the roles of teacher and students as creators of knowledge constructed in light of social purpose. The academic reformers saw the disciplines as the sources of the important knowledge. Teacher and child were seen as receivers either of the concepts of the discipline (the deductive approach) or its methodologies (the inductive approach). Socialization

into the academic community was central to both variations on the academic theme.

The academic reform movement represents a corporate view of teaching. This is a view that teachers are essentially professionals who work together to define academic substance and process and to create settings in which children can explore the areas which have been chosen.

This approach results in more highly organized, systematic approaches to inservice education. Essentially teaching is to execute the purposes of the organization. This does not mean necessarily that the teacher's freedom is greatly restricted, but sees the fulfillment of education more in a communal and collegial way.

## THE ANALYTIC APPROACH TO TEACHING

Teaching can also be seen as sets of behaviors which enable learning to take place. The teacher's work can be analyzed into component dimensions of activity and the skills which make up those components can become the focus of preservice and inservice education. In recent years a variety of approaches to inservice education have been built on these premises. Sets of teaching skills were identified which became the objectives of the minicourses. Sets of concepts which could facilitate teaching activity became the basis for the protocols projects. Many of the modules which make up competency-based programs have been developed after analysis of the teaching act, or for the development of stances for teaching which specify particular kinds of skills as essential to the acts of teaching. Many investigators have pursued a search for "generic" or generally applicable teaching skills which could serve as the cornerstones of such inservice efforts. Among these have been the work of Turner and his associates as they generated the General Catalog of Teaching Skills,[26] the work of Dodl and his associates as they attempted to organize the Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies,[27] and the recent work of Gage, Borg, Ward and others.[28] In such approaches, analyses are made of teaching and instructional systems are developed which teachers can use to teach themselves the teaching skills and strategies necessary to carry out their tasks.

Since the turn of the century there have been attempts to define precisely the competencies which would lead to teacher effectiveness and to develop methods which could reliably and systematically prepare teachers. These efforts have culminated during the last half-dozen years in what is coming to be known as the movement for competency-based teacher education. The movement

itself has a very broad base. Also, its language has been adopted by many writers on teacher education who take positions which appear to be at odds with the core ideas of the competency orientation. It is possible, however, to sort out the strands that have led to it and to define an assumptive world which appears to lie beneath it.

In many ways, the competency orientation is a logical extension of the industrial model of the school. It is based at least in part on the desire to make schooling more efficient and to hold teacher educators and teachers accountable for the effects of their efforts. It employs many techniques originally developed in industrial or military applications of systems technology. Its emphasis on computer-based management systems, the use of multimedia instructional devices, the development of data storage and retrieval systems to store program elements, objectives, and evaluation devices, all represent a look beyond the traditional age to the emerging technetronic industrial age that appears to be close upon us. In this sense, the competency orientation is futuristic.

The philosophical waters are muddied by the application of systems technologies to domains which at first appear to be inimical to them. For example, systematic programs have been developed to train human relations specialists. Personalistic modes such as Gestalt therapy have been submitted to systems analysis and the development of systematic training procedures. A new field, that of behavioral humanism, is emerging from this effort.(29) Some have even claimed, as does the present author, that the competency orientation is a form and a methodology rather than a philosophical orientation and is broad enough to embrace all the modes of education which presently have been developed.(30) This position is vigorously challenged by many. Broudy, for example, finds the competency orientation inherently atheoretical and feels it is not compatible with any important philosophical position.(31) Some proponents of the academic orientation find the competency orientation to be antithetical to the academic training of the teacher.(32)

The antecedents of the movement can be most clearly discerned in the years since 1940. One clear antecedent is the development of systems for analyzing the transactions of teaching in specific behavioral terms. The

interaction analysis systems derived from the work of Anderson and Brewer just before the Second World War and were further developed through the work of Withall, Flanders, Medley and Mitzel, Bellack, B.O. Smith, and others.[33] Simon and Boyer have identified about eighty instruments for classifying the acts of teacher and learner.[34] The first Handbook of Research on Teaching appeared in 1963 after several years of preparation and anchored this literature for researchers on teaching.[35] The behavioral analysis of teaching rested on several assumptions. One was that the acts of teaching and the responses of the learner could be reasonably analyzed into specific, even minute, behavioral components without doing violence to the essential nature of the act. A second was that the mysteries of teaching and some of the mysteries of learning would, over time, be unlocked by this type of research, and that teaching was not an intuitive art but was composed of discernible patterns of behavior, the dimensions of which could be productively changed through training. Many researchers hoped to identify specific components of teacher behavior that would be related to desirable pupil growth. While normally the pupil growth that was studied stemmed from the objectives of the industrial age school, many researchers were seeking clues for methods of reforming education by orienting it toward newer goals in the affective or cognitive areas. Withall and Flanders, for example, studied social climate dimensions of the classroom trying to identify the dynamics of the acts that supported the learner and improved his feelings of self-worth. In this sense the behavioral analysis appeared to support the personalistic orientations. Bellack, Smith, and others concentrated on describing the cognitive acts of teaching. It is not hard to tell from their writings that they hoped to increase the richness of academic content in the classroom and the exercise of creative intellectual power of the student. Spaulding and his associates are directly from the personalistic school, for they analyze the struggles of the learner as he seeks to actualize himself in the setting of the classroom.[36]

Gradually training systems began to be developed based on the category systems. Taba, Spaulding, Flanders, and others employed behavioral systems to help teachers study their teaching and set goals for the

modification of their behavior.[37] Teacher education programs began to adopt the systems and a considerable literature grew up over attempts to modify teacher behavior in this way.[38] The categories of behavior became the goals of training and the assumption was made that a teacher could learn to analyze specific elements of his behavior, gain control over those elements, and thus either modify his patterns in a given direction or develop mastery of a greater repertoire of behaviors.

During the same period, research and development teams began to attempt to lay a basis for the creation of training systems built around specific sets of teacher competencies. Allen and McDonald and their associates at Stanford University developed the technique known as microteaching.[39] They developed a set of teaching skills appropriate for the secondary classroom, and employed the use of videotape recordings to train teachers to discriminate among their own behaviors and to practice new ones to be incorporated into their repertoires. McDonald's recent essay on applications of behavior modification to teacher training traces the origins of their work in behavior modification theory.[40] Popham, Baker, and their associates at the University of California at Los Angeles became the center of a movement to train teachers to select specific behavioral objectives for children, to develop appropriate instructional methodologies, and to evaluate the effects of teaching with precision.[41]

Borg and his associates at the Far West Laboratory developed multimedia training systems built on the microteaching principle.[42] In a similar effort, Joyce, Weil, Wald and their associates built training systems based on a systematic analysis of a variety of models of teaching.[43] These researchers and developers assume not only that teaching is amenable to particularistic analysis but that it can be trained skill-by-skill as well, that the teacher can synthesize a repertoire of specifically taught behaviors into the totality of his act of teaching.

The assumption that teaching could reasonably be studied and trained in segments underlay much research in the late 1960's. Gage and his colleagues, despairing of the global conceptions of teaching that had guided much of the research between 1900 and the mid-1950's, advocated a "micro-criterion" approach based on the very specific study of particular types of teaching acts such as lecturing, counseling and so on, attempting to create

a research base for specific training.[44]

In 1968, an event occurred which unified this movement. The United States Office of Education issued a request for proposals for the application of procedures of systems analysis to the development of training programs for teachers. The request specified that the competencies of the teacher were to be stated in terms of sets of behaviors, that these sets were to be linked to training systems specifically designed to bring about the achievement of the competencies, and that the total program was to be under a management system for purposes of evaluation and improvement. Ten contracts were let. In less than a year, ten teams, working separately, developed a series of complex program models which were widely disseminated and which form much of the substantive base of the movement toward competency-based teacher education.

In addition to their use of systematic planning procedures, the teams operated on certain basic ideas about the teacher and about training programs, although they differed considerably in the application of these ideas to teacher education. Among the ideas, which together constituted a common frame of reference for teaching and teacher training, were the following:

(1) The teacher was viewed as a clinician in much the same sense that physicians are clinicians, that is, as the possessor of strategies for making instructional decisions and of the knowledge and skills needed to carry out these decisions.

(2) Teachers were seen as members of a clinical team, and frequently as specialists on that team.

(3) Needed competencies of the teacher would be defined in terms of specific behaviors and these behaviors would be matched with specific learning experiences and arranged in instructional modules designed to achieve the objectives.

(4) Management and control systems would be developed to monitor teacher training programs to provide them with flexibility that would permit adapting to student requirements.

(5) A consortium of colleges and school districts would be required to provide for the academic training, preservice training, internship or practice teaching, and continuing inservice education needed to prepare teachers for the responsibilities of the classroom.

(6) Training programs would be designed to make extensive use of

simulation laboratories where situations somewhat less complex than the "real world of the teacher" could be used to teach clinical skills.

(7) The teacher would have available to him knowledge from the behavioral sciences which he could use to make and carry out educational decisions.

(8) Provisions would be made for revisions and redevelopment of the training programs.

These common elements in the models suggest that the developers live in an assumed world comprised of management systems theory, concern for efficiency and systematic training, and the belief that the application of these ideas to the education of teachers would mean (a) a more personal environment for the student and a more effective teacher product, and (b) a university in which desirable innovation can be made much more easily than in the present organization.

In keeping with these basic ideas, each team developed its model by going through the following steps, although not necessarily in this order: (a) the development of a performance model of a funtioning teacher; (b) the analysis of the model in terms of sets of behavioral objectives; (c) the specification of program components to accomplish distinct sets of behaviors; (d) the development of an overall training system, with interlocking components so as to achieve an integrated performance at the end of the program; (e) the development of a monitoring system that would make possible the adjustment of the program to individual differences and insure continuous feedback and evaluation; (f) the development of specific procedures for humanistic guidance of the prospective teacher as well as arrangements for a smooth transition from the training institution to the school in which the teacher will work.

The analytic approach makes the assumption that teaching can be broken down into discrete skills which, if acquired, will improve teacher competence. As Neilson and Heath have pointed out[45] there is no solid evidence on which to base this assumption as yet in the sense that there are very few empirically validated teaching skills.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers: A Perceptual View of Teacher Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

(2) Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

(3) Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1968.

(4) See Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969; and Roland Glasser, Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

(5) Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior. New York: Harper, 1949; and Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

(6) See Fritz Perls et al., Gestalt Therapy. New York: Julian Press, 1962; and William C. Schutz, Joy. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

(7) See Paolo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970; Martin Buber, I and Thou. New York: Scribners, 1958; and Maxine Greene, Teacher as Stranger. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.

(8) A.S. Neill, Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1960.

(9) Combs, Ibid.

(10) Ibid., p. 6.

(11) Ibid., p. 9.

(12) Ibid., p. 12.

(13) Ibid., p. 16.

(14) Morris L. Cogan, "Current Issues in the Education of Teachers," in Teacher Education. The Seventh-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Kevin Ryan, ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

(15) Morris L. Cogan, Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973.

(16) Alfred North Whitehead, The Aims of Education and Other Essays. New York: Macmillan, 1929, p. 3.

(17) Ralph Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

(18) The academic community is only one segment of the intellectual community, of course. The reform movement does not represent writers, artists, journalists, and others outside the academic community. Nor do their views necessarily coincide with the academic stance.

(19) The spirit of the movement was captured in a conference of scholars from many disciplines at Woods Hole, Mass. in 1959 and reported by Jerome Bruner in The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963. The earlier years of the academic movement were chronicled by John I. Goodlad in School Curriculum Reform in The United States. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1964.

(20) Bruner, Ibid.

(21) Bruner, op. cit.

(22) David Ausubel, The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1963.

(23) See, for example, Edwin Fenton, The New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1967.

(24) For an analysis of the extrapolation of cognitive psychology to curriculum, see: Edmund V. Sullivan, Piaget and the School. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1967. For an advocacy position, and empirical investigations, see: Irving Sigel and Frank Hooper, eds., Logical Thinking in Children. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968).

(25) Joseph Schwab, The Biology Teacher's Handbook, 1st ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.

(26) Turner, R., "A Catalog of Teaching Skills." Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1974.

(27) The Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies, Florida Department of Education, 1973.

(28) Walter Borg, The Mini Course. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Macmillan Educational Services, 1970.

(29) Carl E. Thoresen, ed., Behavior Modification in Education, Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

(30) Bruce Joyce, "Variations on a Systems Theme," in Perspectives on Reform in Teacher Education, ed. Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

(31) Harry S. Broudy, "A Critique of PBTE." Washington, D. C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1973.

(32) Michael Shugrue, "Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject Matter Fields." Washington, D. C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1973.

(33) Harold H. Anderson and J. E. Brewer, Studies of Teacher Classroom Personality II. Stanford, Calif. Stanford University Press, 1946; John Withall and W.W. Lewis, "Social Interaction in the Classroom," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N.L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963; Ned Flanders, Analyzing Teacher Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970; Donald N. Medley and Harold E. Mitzel, "A Technique for Measuring Classroom Behavior," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, April 1950, 86-92; Arno Bellack, The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966; B.O. Smith, Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D. C.:American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

(34) Anita Simon and Gil Boyer, Mirrors for Behavior. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1967.

(35) Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N.L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

90

(36) Robert Spaulding, "Educational Intervention in Early Childhood." Final Report for the Ford Foundation, Durham, N.C., 1970.

(37) Hilda Taba, Sam Levine, and Freeman Ellzey, Thinking in Elementary School, Cooperative Research Project No. 1574. San Francisco: San Francisco State College, 1964; Flanders, op. cit.; Spaulding, op. cit.

(38) Theodore Amidon and John Hough, Interaction Analysis. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1967.

(39) Dwight Allen and Kevin Ryan, Microteaching. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969; Frederick J. McDonald and Dwight Allen, "Training Effects of Feedback and Modeling Procedures on Teaching Performance," Report (OE-6-10-78) to the United States Office of Education, Stanford University, 1967.

(40) Frederick J. McDonald, "Behavior Modification in Teacher Education," in Thoresen, op. cit., pp. 41-76.

(41) James Popham and Eva Baker, Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

(42) Walter Borg, The Mini Course. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Macmillan Educational Services, 1970.

(43) Bruce Joyce, Marsha Weil, and Rhoda Wald, "Models of Teaching in Teacher Education: An Evaluation of Instructional Systems," Interchange 4, Winter 1974, 47-73.

(44) N.L. Gage, Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1970.

(45) Robert W. Heath and Mark A. Nielson, "The Research Basis for Performance-Based Teacher Education," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 463-483, 1974.

# DEFINITIONS OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

## AN INTUITIVE DEFINITION

Every teacher is also a career-long student. That portion of his education which follows[1] in time his initial certification and employment[2] is known as "inservice teacher education."

## SYNONYMS

The term "inservice education" is not universally acceptable to those who write about teaching. To some it has become repugnant because most of what is done in its name is so terribly boring; to others, who cherish the goal of full professional stature for teaching, the term lacks the proper dignity; to others still, "inservice" is either derogatory or meaningless or out of date.

Out of this discontent have arisen a number of alternative usages to take the place of "inservice education." Most of these can be synthesized from the following sheme:

> To form a suitable synonym for "inservice education"--
> (1) choose one word from Column A and/or one word from Column B; and then (2) choose one word from Column C :

| A | B | C |
|---|---|---|
| "continuing" | "staff" | "development" |
| "continuous" | "professional" | "growth" |
| | "teacher" | "education" |
| | "personnel" | "preparation" |
| | | "renewal" |
| | | "improvement" |

The choice of words depends upon one's view of teaching. Those who aim toward achieving wider acceptance of teaching as a profession tend to favor "professional development." Those who are working toward unionization of teachers may prefer "personnel" to "professional." From the

administrative viewpoint of the school or school district, one might be concerned with "continuing staff development." "Development" and "growth" have generally a more positive connotation than either "renewal" or "improvement," both of which may connote some sort of deficiency.

Other terms used in place of "inservice education" have not been so popular. "Retraining" brings to mind the unpleasant realities of the current job market for teachers. "Graduate study" is unambiguous enough but includes only a portion of the range of inservice activities actually being conducted as inservice education.

## DEFINITIONS

Whatever alternative term one may wish to use--and certainly some of the suggested replacements do raise serious issues about the present and future condition of inservice education--the fact remains that "inservice education" has not been effectively replaced and is still the most widely used term for what we are discussing here. Let us now proceed to a somewhat more substantial discussion, that of how "inservice teacher education" is to be defined.

We take as the starting point the definition offered by C. Glen Hass in the NSSE's 1957 yearbook, Part I, entitled In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators:(3)

> Broadly conceived, in-service education includes all activities engaged in by the professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job.

A quick analysis of this definition shows that it answers four questions:

| | |
|---|---|
| WHAT? | "all activities" |
| BY WHOM? | "by the professional personnel" |
| WHEN? | "during their service" |
| WHY? | "designed to contribute to improvement on the job" |

Now we leap ahead eighteen years to the NSSE's 1975 yearbook, Part II, entitled Teacher Education, in which a definition is given by Morris L. Cogan:(4)

> In-service education of teachers is commonly understood to include the collegiate and

> school-based programs of professional study and work in which the teacher is involved after he has been certified and employed.

Several contrasts with the earlier definition are apparent. For one, the what of inservice has been narrowed considerably from "all activities" to "programs of professional study and work;" this change would still include most types of inservice teacher education but would eliminate a few, such as educational travel or cultural experiences. There are other ways to learn besides working and studying. For another, there is an added question answered: where? Certainly most inservice teacher education programs do take place at the school or at a college or university, but again--not all: professional conventions, independent teacher centers, and personal independent research are examples. A third difference is that the who is restricted from "professional personnel" in 1957 to "teachers" in 1975. Supervisors and administrators have been dropped from consideration. Perhaps this is merely an oversight; on the other hand, it may signal a declining interest in inservice education for those two job categories compared with the interest in teacher inservice. The change in the when of inservice teacher education from "during their service" to "after...certified and employed" is merely a more precise formulation and not a change in substance. The why of inservice teacher education, finally, is omitted from the 1975 definition. This may be seen as a broadening tendency. No longer, in other words, is the purpose of inservice teacher education limited to improvement of classroom performance; other purposes, such as personal fulfillment or educational advancement, may be considered.

Another interesting comparison of definitions over time is provided by two NEA publications. The first definition is from a paper by the Research Division of that association in 1966:(5)

> The term inservice education is used by educators to denote efforts of administrative and supervisory officials to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of educational personnel.

This definition is of little use, since by current usage it is tautological: it serves no purpose to define "inservice education" in terms of "professional growth and development." What is interesting here, however, is that inservice is seen as an activity undertaken by supervisors and administrators

for the sake of teachers and other personnel.

Contrast with this definition the one posited nine years later in the introduction of an NEA book entitled Rethinking In-Service Education, published in 1975:[6]

> In-service education of teachers (or staff development, continuing education, professional development) is defined as any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice.

This definition is also tautological because inservice is defined in terms of one of its synonyms. Here there is no mention of administrators or supervisors. Inservice is something initiated by the teacher himself, alone or with others. Presumably other parties--supervisors, professors, consultants--may be involved in conducting the inservice, but there is no mention of that possibility in the definition.

Inservice can be defined either broadly or narrowly. Consider this definition from Harris and Bessent's In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice, published in 1969:[7]

> Broadly defined, in-service education must include all activities aimed at the improvement of professional staff members. Since this conception is too broad to be useful for the purposes of this book, however, we are defining in-service education as planned activities for the instructional improvement of professional staff members.

The two limitations that Harris and Bessent impose are (1) that only planned activities are to be considered and (2) that instructional improvement is the only goal. This definition would exclude quite a few activities that might otherwise be considered inservice education but probably serves their purpose of providing a practitioner's guidebook for running inservice programs.

The element of planning or systematic design is reiterated in another definition from Rethinking In-Service Education, in an essay by Orrange and Van Ryn:[8]

> Inservice education is that portion of professional development that should be publicly supported and includes a program of systematically designed activities planned to increase the competencies--knowledge, skills, and attitudes--needed by school personnel in the performance of their assigned responsibilities.

This definition also limits the purpose of inservice to instructional improvement, although it is stated somewhat more broadly ("performance of their assigned responsibilities") and in terms of the contemporary trend toward competency-based teacher education. The novel element here, aside from the reference to competencies, is the notion that inservice should be publicly financed. The question of finance is certainly an issue in inservice teacher education, but whether a position on the issue should be part of the definition of the term is open to doubt. Such a definition might exclude many of the efforts undertaken personally by teachers or collectively by teacher associations.

Inservice education--and its synonyms--has different meanings for different writers. Perhaps one useful solution to the problem of diverging definitions would be to employ different terms to distinguish the different purposes of what is usually lumped under the single heading of inservice education. Robert Howsam in a 1974 essay in Governance by Consortium attempted just such a distinction:(9)

> According to this set of categories "in-service" education is defined as special preparation needed by virtue of being assigned to a situation where an approach is used which would not customarily be learned in the pre-service program nor would the teacher normally have learned it in some other way. For example, the school or district might adopt the Individually Guided Education (IGE) system of teaching. The teachers have been educated in individualization of instruction but not in the particular system which IGE uses. It is the employer who, by his choice, created the demand for the training. He should, therefore, identify the program of preparation as "in-service" and make all provisions for it. Thus, "in-service" is training, the need for which is derived directly from particularized approaches adopted by the employer or from assignments made by him.
>
> "Continuing professional education" is education following entry to the profession, the need for which is derived from development of knowledge and skills which were not available at the time of pre-service preparation or were not included in the preparatory program. In teaching, this consists both of needs in the area of the teaching field (academic) and in professional knowledge and practice.
>
> The three categories of education for teachers are particularly useful in allocating responsibilities among the several parties:
>
> 1. Pre-service is offered by colleges or universities according to standards established for training by the

profession. In this area the collaboration of schools and associations is sought.
2. In-service is the responsibility of the employer who may offer it directly, contract to have it offered, or subsidize the individual in his own pursuit of the learning.
3. Continuing education is the responsibility of the individual, but making it possible is a responsibility shared by all interested parties.

To round out our discussion of the definitions of inservice education, let us consider finally the definition used by the committee which prepared the James Report, Teacher Education and Training, in England in 1972:[10]

> The third cycle (inservice education) comprehends the whole range of activities by which teachers can extend their personal education, develop their professional competence and improve their understanding of educational principles and techniques.

Note that this English definition is comprehensive ("the whole range of activities") rather than restrictive in scope. Further, it recognizes three legitimate purposes: (1) extension of the teacher's personal education (whether or not this contributes to improvement of his performance); and two purposes for instructional improvement, (2) professional competence (academic field or subject matter) and (3) educational principles and techniques. These latter two happen to coincide with the two facets of what Howsam defines as "continuing professional education."

## ISSUES RAISED BY THE DEFINITIONS

The purpose of comparing and contrasting various definitions of inservice teacher education is not so much to try to find one that is "correct" or even one that is more widely applicable than the rest. Each one is correct in its own way, and yet none is correct to the exclusion of the others. Obviously, different writers have different purposes in mind. A school administrator, for example, in charge of inservice programs for a district or a school needs a different definition from a university professor proposing new organizational structures for cooperative efforts in teacher education. The real purpose of the comparisons is to show that there are different points of view and to raise the issues implicit in them.

At this point it seems useful to review the definitions presented

above, with a view toward explicating the alternative answers to the questions they raise.

(1) WHEN? This is the one element in the definitions on which there are no substantive differences. The various ways of phrasing "inservice"--"following entry to the profession" (Howsam), "during service" (Hass), "after...certified and employed" (Cogan), or "after receiving... initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice" (Edelfelt and Johnson)--all mean the same thing. The other definitions do not even specify a time element.

(2) WHAT? There are two basic approaches to the scope of inservice education: comprehensive or restrictive. Either everything is included that in any way contributes to the continuing education of teachers (Hass, Edelfelt and Johnson, Harris and Bessent (broad), James Report); or else the range of activities is restricted in some way. The most common definitional restrictions are that the activity be part of a planned, systematic program (Harris and Bessent (narrow), Orrange and Van Ryn) or that the activity consist of either work or study (Cogan).

(3) WHERE? Here again the primary choice is between some restriction and no restriction. Most definitions do not restrict inservice education to any particular locations. Cogan specifies the school and the college as the two proper places for conducting inservice.

(4) BY WHOM? The question of who shall conduct inservice teacher education is one of the central issues in the field. The two extremes found in the definitions above both come from NEA publications: "administrative or supervisory officials" (NEA Research Division) and "a teacher... singly or with other teachers" (Edelfelt and Johnson). Most definitions decline to limit the "change agent" to any specific category of persons, thereby allowing a wide range of possible inservice trainers. This stance reflects the actual situation in inservice education: several different categories of persons do in fact conduct inservice teacher education--teachers themselves, administrators, supervisors, professors, consultants. This issue seems to be a factual one--depending on the circumstances in each situation--and not properly an a priori definitional one.

(5) FOR WHOM? The basic issue here is whether a scheme of in-service education should provide training for classroom teachers only

(Cogan, Edelfelt and Johnson, James Report); for teachers, supervisors, and administrators (Hass/NSSE 1957); or for some other, more broadly defined group. The latter category may be expressed as "educational personnel" (NEA Research Division), "professional staff members" (Harris and Bessent), or "school personnel" (Orrange and Van Ryn). A broad definition of the recipients of inservice education is probably useful here, in light of the variety of new roles being explored in teaching, such as in differentiated staffing, team teaching, and the use of paraprofessionals.

(6) THROUGH WHOM? The question of who is responsible (and who pays) for inservice education is another central issue in the field. This issue is to be distinguished from the issue of who conducts inservice education, although the issues are related and the parties involved in the solutions to the two issues may often coincide. This is the political and fiscal issue--who initiates inservice teacher education programs, evaluates them, changes them, controls them? Most of the definitions considered in this paper do not address this question. Orrange and Van Ryn include the vague requirement that inservice education"should be publicly supported." Howsam's set of categories here is probably the most useful, allocating the primary responsibilities among the interested parties: "pre-service" to the colleges; "in-service" to the employers (i.e., the schools); and "continuing professional" to the individual teacher. This issue is also among the most complex in inservice education and should perhaps not be settled a priori by a definition.

(7) WHY? The issue of what the purpose of inservice teacher education should be has more divergent answers than any other issue addressed by the definitions. Let us consider the various purposes envisaged:

(a) 'to contribute to improvement on the job" (Hass);

(b) "to promote professional growth and development" (NEA Research Division);

(c) "improvement of professional staff members" (Harris and Bessent (broad));

(d) "instructional improvement of professional staff members" (Harris and Bessent (narrow));

(e) "to increase the competencies--knowledge, skills, and attitudes--needed...in the performance of...assigned responsibilities" (Orrange and Van Ryn);

(f) "special preparation needed by virtue of being assigned to a situation" (Howsam--"in-service education");

(g) "development of knowledge and skills which were not available at the time of pre-service preparation" (Howsam--"continuing professional education");

(h) to "extend...personal education" (James Report);

(i) to "develop...professional competence" (James Report); and

(j) to "improve...understanding of educational principles and techniques" (James Report).

These various purposes can be summarized into three broad categories:

(A) JOB-ORIENTED: This is education to meet the needs of the specific job situation in which the teacher finds himself. The priorities here are set presumably by the employer. They include--although this is not mentioned in any of the definitions --the specific educational needs of the children being taught. (Purposes (a), (d), (e), (f)).

(B) PROFESSION-ORIENTED: This is education as a teaching professional, regardless of any specific job assignment. (Purposes (b), (g), (i), (j)).

(C) PERSON-ORIENTED: This is education for the sake of the teacher as an individual, beyond the requirements of the job or even of the profession. (Purposes (c) and (h)).

Of course the purposes of inservice education and their inclusion in or omission from a definition of "inservice education" will vary according to the writer and his situation--what he needs his definition for.

(8) HOW? The issue of how inservice education should be conducted--what techniques, what media of instruction--has been, appropriately, omitted from the definitions given. The closest approach to the issue is the question-begging reference to "by appropriate means" in the NEA Research Division's paper. This issue is entirely a factual one.

DEFINITIONS AND ISSUES

A comparative analysis of eight definitions of "inservice teacher

education," drawn from various sources in two countries over the span of eighteen years, recapitulates a summary of the major issues today in the field of inservice education. This result is surprising, to this reviewer at least.

One would think that definitions (if not arguments or positions) would tend to converge, or that if they tended to diverge (as they in fact did), they would in any case not provide any hint of the substantive, factual problems in the field. Quite the contrary is true. The results of this analysis--a catalogue of issues and problems--are reproduced rather closely by the literature reviews of collaborative arrangements[11] and of the varieties and contexts[12] of inservice teacher education which follow.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) That portion of the teacher's education which precedes his initial certification and employment is known as "preservice teacher education." "Preservice" generally corresponds in fact with college or university preparation for teaching, whereas "inservice" is often treated as a residual category and therefore is used to include everything else in a teacher's education thereafter.

(2) This is, of course, a working definition. It is not meant to be uniformly precise or valid when applied to every possible variation in teacher preparation practices, such as student teaching or provisional certification.

(3) C. Glen Hass, "In-service Education Today," Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators: The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, p. 13. Chicago: NSSE, 1957.

(4) Morris L. Cogan, "Current Issues in the Education of Teachers," Kevin Ryan, ed., Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, p. 220. Chicago: NSSE, 1975.

(5) Research Division, National Education Association, Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-S1, p. 3. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. ERIC ED 022 728.

(6) Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, Introduction to Rethinking In-Service Education, p. 5. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

(7) Ben M. Harris and Wailand Bessent, In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice, p. 2. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

(8) Patricia A. Orrange and Mike Van Ryn, "Agency Roles and Responsibilities," Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, eds., Rethinking In-Service Education, p. 47. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

(9) Robert B. Howsam, "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium," John H. Hansen, ed., Governance by Consortium, p. 18. Syracuse: The Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1974.

(10) Teacher Training and Education: A Report by a Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme, p. 5, para. 2.2. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.

(11) See section on collaborative arrangements in inservice teacher education, elsewhere in this review.

(12) See section on the varieties and contexts of inservice teacher education, elsewhere in this review.

# OTHER ISSUES IN INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

## A REVIEW OF THE REVIEW

This literature review has already raised and discussed the major contemporary issues in inservice teacher education. Definitions analyzed the various ways in which writers have differed in defining the term over the past two decades, and from these differences elicited a series of substantive issues concerning the subject. Varieties examined the full gamut of different activities actually being conducted as inservice teacher education, and suggested a typology of contexts within which to understand them as a whole. Varieties also reviewed the history and current state of the art of research on inservice teacher education. Collaborative Arrangements explored the possible interrelationships of the various entities concerned with inservice education--their interests, their responsibilities, and their limitations. This final section of the literature review will detail several remaining issues that have not been fully treated in the preceding sections.

## EVALUATION

Perhaps no other single element in an inservice program is so important as evaluation. One writer has called evaluation "the most powerful tool and most significant variable"[1] in inservice education. Although it is doubtful that evaluation should be considered, strictly speaking, a variable, its importance is nonetheless undeniable. Evaluation is essential both for assessing the degree of success of past inservice programs and for guiding the direction of future programs. In the financial aspect of inservice education, evaluation "serves to give an account of the effectiveness of money spent and to justify future financing of inservice programs."[2]

Aside from the centrality of evaluation to any scheme of inservice education, the one point on which virtually all the literature agrees is the lack of adequate evaluation systems.[3] One writer, who made a compre-

hensive survey of evaluation methods, concluded that there is no systematic, generally applicable method of evaluation yet developed.[4] Almost all the studies reviewed were purely descriptive.[5] Among the more common methods currently in use are the following: questionnaire, self-report, behavioral observation, comparative testing of teachers, and comparative testing of pupils.[6]

The problem here is one that strikes deep. First, all the assumptions underlying the purposes of inservice education must be made explicit; so far, they have not been. Once this has been done--the philosophical foundations laid, positing the existence of an agreed-upon, measurable quantity--then the technology of measurement must be developed and refined to the point where it is universally applicable.

INCENTIVES

An issue discussed in the literature almost as much as evaluation is that of incentives (or motivation or rewards). The problem of incentives is not so serious as that of evaluation, for which it is generally agreed that there is no existing solution and little hope for one in the near future. There are already many recognized, traditional methods of motivating teachers to continue their education.[7] Most of these involve linking salary increments to a certain number of "units" or "credits" for inservice activities, in whatever form the teacher chooses (workshops, college courses, etc.).

The problem with incentives is basically this: inservice education in the past has not been effective enough, and it is going to become much more important in the near future.[8] New incentive systems, therefore, are going to have to be developed in order for other inservice goals to be accomplished. It is not that the traditional formula (inservice units adding up to increased salary) will have to be discarded, but rather alternative methods of rewards must be added.

The essence of the new approaches to incentives is teacher participation. A major review of studies of inservice programs concluded that those with the best chance of being effective are "those that involve teachers in planning and managing their own professional development activities, pursuing personal and collective objectives, sharing, applying new learnings and receiving feedback."[9]

There are several different ways of structuring teacher participation into inservice programs. One route is through the teacher association. The NEA and the AFT are both advocating that inservice become a subject of collective bargaining and that certain guarantees and limitations concerning inservice be incorporated into the teacher's contract.(10) Another approach is to provide the teacher with time plus resources: either released time during the school week or else a sabbatical leave; and resources in the form of a teacher center or library or other enabling facilities for independent work.

The basic flaw in the traditional incentive scheme is that the means (accumulation of inservice units) has replaced the end (improved professional performance).

ANCILLARY PROBLEMS

A review of the literature reveals that a considerable amount of thought and effort has been directed toward using inservice teacher education in conjunction with certain other problems in education. This is an interesting phenomenon. These are not problems internal to inservice education itself; these are problems to which inservice education is seen as a possible solution. We choose to call them ancillary problems, as they stand in a dependent relation to inservice education.

Another way of approaching these problems is to consider them as secondary purposes of inservice teacher education. The primary purposes of inservice teacher education have been discussed above: they relate to the job, to the profession, and to the individuality of teachers, and they are generally applicable in any inservice situation. Secondary purposes, on the other hand, are chosen on an ad hoc basis and are applicable only in particular situation within the context of a limited time and location.

Although these problems are not by their nature internal to inservice teacher education, the design of inservice teacher education programs with a view toward solving them does have serious implications for inservice teacher education itself. Several basic questions suggest themselves. What are the proper limits, if any, to the use of inservice teacher education for serving purposes other than its primary ones? To what extent, in the practical realm, can inservice teacher education be stretched to cover other

problem areas in the broader field of education? These questions should be kept in mind during the following brief recapitulation of the major ancillary problems to the solution of which inservice teacher education programs have been addressed.

As the political and social climate of the country changes, inservice education programs are often seen as the primary vehicle for reflecting these changes in the school. The most important historical example of this trend is the use of inservice teacher education to promote desegregation in the schools.[11] The trend continues today, although the terminology and the emphases are different. The heavy emphasis on desegregation in the literature of a few years ago has somewhat diminished in the last five years. Emphasis is shifting to "multi-cultural awareness" and teachers are being asked to modify their unconsciously racist attitudes toward minority children.[12] If, as several studies have suggested,[13] attitude change is the most difficult type of objective to achieve through inservice teacher education, this area will probably continue to receive quite a lot of attention in proportion to results achieved.

The next most important ancillary problem for inservice teacher education is curriculum change. Inservice programs are seen as necessary for installing new developments in the schools--new content in both traditional (e.g., "new math") and innovative (e.g., black history) subject areas, new teaching techniques (e.g., microteaching), and the use of new equipment (e.g., videotape recorders). In addition, there are two countervailing trends in curriculum theory, both of which seek to use inservice teacher education to accomplish their goals. The first is the trend toward systematic instruction, the creation of a national curriculum.[14] The other is the trend toward individualizing curriculum to reflect the current and local needs of the immediate community.[15]

Several other ancillary problems deserve mention in passing. The professionalization of teaching is often viewed as dependent upon a strong program of continuing education, comparable to that found in medicine and law, and to that end inservice is indispensable. Various societal problems, such as preventing dropouts,[16] have been addressed through inservice teacher education programs. Finally, the oversupply of both teachers and teacher educators has been sought to be relieved through increased emphasis on and utilization of inservice education.

REFERENCE NOTES

(1) Paul W. Devore, Variables Affecting Change in Inservice Teacher Education, p. 58. ERIC ED 070 764, 1971.

(2) Gordon Lawrence, et al., Patterns of Effective Inservice Education, p. 20. Tallahassee: Florida Dept. of Education, 1974.

(3) See, e.g., Devore, op. cit.; Paul Mohr, Current Research and Development Efforts in Inservice Training and Curriculum Planning for Teacher Education, ERIC ED 087 148, 1971; William G. Ward, A Review of Literature and Research on Inservice Training for Teachers with Emphasis on Vocational and Technical Teachers, ERIC ED 073 244, 1972.

(4) Lillian M. Wehmeyer, "Evaluation of In-Service Education: A Survey of Methods," California Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 2, no. 2, October 1974, pp. 102-10. ERIC EJ 108 318.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.; Research Division, National Education Association, Inservice Education of Teachers; Research Summary 1966-S1. ERIC ED 022 728, 1966.

(7) For a thorough discussion of traditional incentives in inservice teacher education see N. Durward Cory, "Incentives Used in Motivating Professional Growth of Teachers." ERIC ED 027 254.

(8) Roy A. Edelfelt, "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 25, no. 3,Fall 1974, pp. 250-52.

(9) Lawrence, op. cit., p. 17.

(10) See, e.g., Robert A. Luke, "Collective Bargaining and Inservice Education, to be published in late spring of 1976 in Phi Delta Kappan.

(11) See, e.g., Effie N. Bynum, "Desegregation, Preservice and Inservice Training: An Annotated, Targeted Bibliography." ERIC ED 049 350, 1971.

(12) See, e.g., Erwin Flaxman, "A Selected Bibliography on Teacher Attitudes. ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged." ERIC 027 357, 1969.

(13) See, e.g., Lawrence, op. cit., p. 13.

(14) See, e.g., Malvin G. Villeme, "Promoting Systematic Instruction Through In-Service Education." ERIC ED 102 129.

(15) John D. Haas, "Diffusion of Curriculum Products Through Inservice Education." ERIC ED 098 120, 1974.

(16) Chicago Public Schools, Illinois, "Provisions for Potential Dropouts Through In-Service Education for Teachers." ERIC ED 013 769, 1964.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CORPS RECRUITMENT AND TECHNICAL RESOURCE CENTERS

Western RTR Center
William C. Hill, Director
University of Southern California
311 South Spring
Los Angeles, California 90015
(213) 625-7204

Midwestern RTR Center
Floyd T. Waterman, Director
University of Nebraska
Center for Urban Education
3805 North 16th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68110
(402) 554-2773

Great Lakes RTR Center
Barbara A. Vance, Director
Wayne State University
2978 W. Grand Boulevard, 2nd floor
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 577-1618

Northeastern RTR Center
Donald W. Parker, Director
Howard University
1411 K Street, N.W., Suite 420
Washington, D. C. 20005
(202) 737-7868

Southeastern RTR Center
Michael G. Baker, Director
University of Georgia
337 South Milledge Avenue, Room 209
Athens, Georgia 30601
(404) 542-5862

Chief of Center Operations:

Velma Robinson
Teacher Corps
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
(202) 245-8275

APPENDIX B

PROJECT CONSULTANT INTERVIEWERS

| | |
|---|---|
| Ursula Anderson | Midwestern RTR Center |
| Roxie Bagley | Western RTR Center |
| Michael Baker | Southeastern RTR Center |
| Wilbert Bledsoe | Great Lakes RTR Center |
| James Boyer | Kansas State University |
| Elsa Brizzi | University of Southern California |
| Carol Bryant | Wayne County Junior College, Detroit |
| Roger G. Bryant | Southeastern RTR Center |
| Ronald Butler | Carroll County, Georgia School System |
| Francine Clemons | Washington, D. C. Public Schools |
| Paul Collins | New York Teacher Corps Network |
| Suzie Collins | Pasadena Unified School District |
| Carol Coy | Northeastern RTR Center |
| Joyce Ellis | Boston Indian Council |
| Floyd Falany | Reinhart College |
| Paul Fisher | University of Southern California |
| Eugene George | University of South Carolina |
| Eileen Goins | University of Seattle |
| Turner Goodlow | Houston Independent School District |
| John Green | University of South Alabama |
| Marilyn Harper | Stanford University |
| Edith Harrison | Portland COP Project |
| William C. Hill | Western RTR Center |
| Willie Hodge | University of Toledo |
| Janet Hunter | Compton Unified School District |
| Andrew Johnson | Wayne State University |
| Bruce Joyce | Stanford University |
| Mary Kelley | Consultant, Worcester, Mass. |
| Hal Knight | West Virginia Institute |
| Margaret Koch | Pasadena Unified School District |

| | |
|---|---|
| Reba Lassiter | Pasadena Unified School District |
| Billie Lipsey | Detroit Public Schools |
| Mary Logan | Federal City College |
| Patricia Matthews | Northeastern RTR Center |
| Donald Mims | Los Angeles City Schools |
| Barbara Ogletree | Southeastern RTR Center |
| Roger Pankratz | Western Kentucky University |
| Donald Parker | Northeastern RTR Center |
| Lucy Peck | Hofstra University |
| Lorenzo Reid | Consultant, Washington, D. C. |
| Terry Rice | Stanford University |
| Joseph Romo | Western RTR Center |
| Richard Stroup | Costa Mesa School District |
| Beulah Tumpkin | Consultant, Detroit |
| Rupert Trujillo | University of New Mexico |
| Barbara Vance | Great Lakes RTR Center |
| Susan Vernand | Pasadena Unified School District |
| Floyd Waterman | Midwestern RTR Center |
| Doris Wilson | Southeastern RTR Center |
| James Wilson | Wayne State University |
| Roger Wilson | Northern Arizona University |